

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1914.

## THUCYDIDEA.

### PART II. MISCELLANEOUS EMENDATIONS (*continued*).

#### BOOK V.

1. *τοῦτο τῆς καθάρσεως*. Perhaps *τὸ τῆς κ.* Cf. 3. 59. 1 *τὸ τῆς ξυμφορᾶς*: 6. 60. 4 *τὸ τῶν Ἐρμῶν*.

2. 2. A numeral missing with *όπλιτας*? Cf. the words immediately above. See my *Aristophanes and Others*, p. 321, and below on 8. 62. 2.

4. 6. *αισθόμενος οὐκ ἀν πείθειν αὐτούς*.

Probably *πείθων*, though *αισθάνομαι* is followed by an accusative and infinitive in 6. 59. 3. Soph. *O.C.* 797 *οἶδα γάρ σε ταῦτα μὴ πείθων*.

9. 6. *ἔως . . . θαρσοῦσι καὶ τοῦ ὑπαπιέναι πλέον ἢ τοῦ μένοντος . . . τὴν διάνοιαν ἔχουσι*.

Besides the awkwardness of infinitive and neuter participle made parallel, it may be noticed that *διάνοιαν ἔχουσιν ὑπαπιέναι* would be the more usual expression. Perhaps *τοῦ* (masc.) *ὑπαπιέναι πλέον ἢ τοῦ μένειν μέλλοντος*.

*ib.* 9. *ὑπάρξειν* for *ὑπάρχειν*? Cf. on III. 2.

16. 2. *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ*, not *ἑαυτῶν*. In 7. 3. 3, where MSS. offer both (as they do in 5. 8. 3), *ἑαυτοῦ* is again better, unless we were to read *ἵστιχαζον*. Xen. *Hell.* 5. 4. 13 is a little different.

ib. 3. *ἥμισυ τῆς οἰκίας τοῦ ἱεροῦ τότε τοῦ Διὸς οἰκοῦντα* is a strange and—in spite of 1. 134. 1—very questionable phrase. In the line before this the older MSS. have a detached and doubtful *ἔως* or *ἔως* following *δοκοῦσαν*, out of which later ones make *δοκήσεως*. May we conjecture *τῆς οἰκίας τοῦ ἱερέως τότε τοῦ Διός?* *τότε* will probably go with *ἱερέως*.

17. 2. Surely *προδόντων* is a mistake for *παραδόντων*: *προδιδόναι* is never used in this sense. The same correction has been made in 6. 4. 1.

18. 4. *δικαίῳ <λόγῳ> χρίσθων καὶ ὄρκοις?* Cf. II λόγοις δικαίους *χρωμένοις*: 37. 2 *κοινῷ λόγῳ χρωμένους*: 1. 76. 2 *τῷ δικαίῳ λόγῳ νῦν χρῆσθε*: Soph. *O.C.* 762.

*ib.* 5. Editors seem not to notice sufficiently the great peculiarity of tenses in *ὅσας πόλεις παρέδοσαν* and *ἐπειδὴ αἱ σπονδαὶ ἐγένοντο*, which do not refer to anything past at the making of the treaty, but to what will be past at some future time, what in fact would in Latin be expressed by the future perfect. A similar use is found in 6. 80. 2 *τί ἄλλο ἡ . . . τοῖς μὲν οὐκ ἡμύννατε σωθῆναι, τοὺς δὲ οὐκ ἐκωλύσατε κακούς γενέσθαι*, where the aorists refer to the future, and in *Od.* 14. 404 *ὅς σ' ἐπεὶ ἐστι κλισίην ἄγαγον καὶ ξείνια δῶκα αὐτὶς δὲ κτείναιμι κ.τ.λ.* Even in Stahl's *Syntax des gr. Verbums* this remarkable construction goes unmentioned.

20. 1. The uncalled-for *ἡ* before *ώς* is perhaps only a repetition of the *ν* (*N H* often confused) preceding it. Cf. 26. 3 *ἡμέρας οὐ πολλὰς παρενεγκόντας*.

26. 5. *παρ' ἀμφοτέρους τοῖς πράγμασι. ἀμφοτέρων?* In 7. 63. 4 Classen's *έτέρων* (for *έτέρας*) *ρώμης* is attractive.

27. 2. *ἀποδεῖξαι* δὲ *ἄνδρας ὀλίγους ἀρχὴν αὐτοκράτορας. αὐτοκράτορα?* Cf. 1. 96. 2 *Ἐλληνοταμίᾳ . . . κατέστη ἀρχή.* (So too Steup.)

40. 3. Perhaps *ἔγχωρῆ*, not *ξυγχωρῆ*. In Xen. *Eg.* 9. 11 MSS. give both words.

60. 5 (end). *γενέσθαι?*

63. 1. *παρασχὸν καλῶς ώς οὕπω πρότερον αὐτοῖς ἐνομίζον.*

There is little force in *αὐτοῖς*. Read *αὐτοῖς* or *αὐτοῖς*, like the datives in 60. 2 and 5 with *παρατυχόν* and *παρασχόν*.

*ib.* 3. *ἔργῳ γὰρ ἀγαθῷ ῥύσεσθαι τὰς αἰτίας.* The use of *ῥύομαι* in Soph. *O.T.* 313 supports this to some extent. If it is wrong, we might read *ἴάσεσθαι*, *ἴασθαι* and *ἀκεῖσθαι* being often thus used (as in 65. 2) and *ι* sometimes exchanging with *ρ*.

66. 1. Perhaps *ὅτε* has been lost before *οἵ τε Ἀργεῖοι*.

*ib.* 2. *ἔξεπλάγησαν* were surprised, taken aback, not frightened. Cf. 4. 14. 3; 6. 46. 4, and 70. 1: Plat. *Euthyph.* 6 c: Eur. *Phoen.* 729, 961: *Hel.* 549.

71. 3. *τοῦν πολεμάρχουν* with 'I. and 'A. in apposition? But the genitive may be right. Cf. 8. 73. 4 and other places.

72. 2. The antithesis of *ἐμπειρία* and *ἀνδρεία* (by these or similar names) is so frequent that there cannot be any reasonable doubt of its being right here. As to the unlikelihood of the Spartans failing in *ἐμπειρία*, it may be noted (1) that *ἐμπειρία* and *ἀπειρία*, etc., came to signify sometimes *knowledge, skill*, or the want of it, rather than possession or lack of *experience* (1. 142. 5, 6. 1. 1, etc. In 6. 68. 2 and 69. 1 *ἐπιστήμη* is used in the same antithesis); and (2) that the phrase may refer rather to the general than to the army.

76. 3. *τὸν μὲν (λόγον) καθ' ὅτι εἰ βούλονται πολεμεῖν, τὸν δὲ ως εἰ εἰρήνην ἀγεῖν.*

*ώς* should perhaps be *καί*, the two words being often confused. For the construction of the clauses cf. on 3. 52. 2.

83. 4. Perdiccas *ἔψευστο τὴν ξυμμαχίαν καὶ ἡ στρατεία μάλιστα διελύθη ἐκείνου ἀπάραντος.*

The last word is generally allowed to be wrong, and such substitutes have been proposed as ἀπαρηθέντος, ἀποστάντος, ἀποδράντος (out of the question), οὐ παρόντος. I take it that the right word is one with the parts of which those of ἀπάιρω and ἀπορῶ often exchange, e.g. *Philebus* 67 B (cf. Cobet, *N.L.* p. 779), namely ἀπεροῦντος. The gathering broke up because it was found that Perdiccas was going to fail them.

88. εἰκός . . . καὶ λέγοντας καὶ δοκοῦντας τρέπεσθαι.

ἀκούοντας as one listens for δοκοῦντας (A for Δ) seems not unlikely, as λέγω and ἀκούω so often go together. ἀκούοντας would refer back to διδάσκειν in 86, as δοκοῦντας to ὑπονοίας in 87. For Thucydides the use of δοκῶ think is not beyond question, just as it probably never occurs in Plato, though very frequent in Xenophon. Its absolute use here is especially remarkable.

89. οἵ <τε> προύχοντες ?

95. ἡ φύλα ἡ μέν has been suggested and may be right. If not, I would take παράδειγμα as =παράδειγμά ἔστι. The substantive verb has often to be supplied in this dialogue, e.g. 90, 91, 100, 101, 102.

105. 1. τῆς . . . πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐμενέας οὐδ' ἡμεῖς οἰόμεθα λελείψεσθαι.

πρὸς τοῦ θείου is suggested (Krüger, Steup), and at first sight is very plausible; cf. 112. 2 ἐκ τοῦ θείου. But the following passages are enough with this to guarantee the accusative: Plat. *Euthyphro* 15 Ε τῆς πρὸς Μέλητον γραφῆς ἀπαλλάξομαι: *Republic* 470 A ἔαν τι ἡμῖν μέλη τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους "Ελληνας εὐνοίας: Hyperides 6. 27 ἐφόδιον εἰς τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὔνοιαν τὴν . . . ἀρετήν . . . ἔξοντιν: Dem. 20. 25 τὸν πρὸς ἄπαντα πιστεύεσθαι: Plut. *Comp. Lyc. et Num.* τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ἐτήρησε πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρας.

105. 3. οὐ φοβούμεθα ἐλασσώσεσθαι.

There is no parallel for a future infinitive with φοβοῦμαι. Above (104) μὴ ἐλασσώσεσθαι depends on πιστεύομεν, and λελείψεσθαι (105. 1) on οὐκ οἰόμεθα. Probably an οἱόμενοι, ἥγούμενοι, νομίζοντες has dropped out here.

106. Should we read ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦτο [καὶ] ? μάλιστα δὴ πιστεύομεν τῷ ξυμφέροντι αὐτῶν ?

111. 2. παρέξετε ? cf. on 9. 9. Four futures follow.

ib. 3. πολλοῖς γὰρ προορωμένοις ἔτι ἐσ οἴα φέρονται τὸ αἰσχρὸν καλούμενον ὄνόματος ἐπαγγελῆ δυνάμει ἐπεσπάσατο ἡσσηθεῖσι τοῦ βήματος ἔργῳ ξυμφορᾶς ἀνηκέστοις ἐκόντας περιπεσεῖν.

As the words stand, there is no construction for the datives πολλοῖς προορ. unless we take ἐπεσπάσατο in the sense, strange for the middle, draws down upon. The natural sense, draws on, allures, is so suitable here that we should wish to retain it, if possible. πολλοῖς προορωμένους is of course forbidden by ἡσσηθεῖσι following. ἡσσηθεῖσι is also to some extent against the plausible conjecture ἐπεσπασε τό, for then ἡσσηθέντας would be more usual.

I conjecture that after αἰσχρὸν two very similar letters, εν or εγ, have been lost, and that Thucydides wrote ἐγκαλούμενον, which will account for the datives πολλοῖς προορ. Very similar in expression and in general meaning is the language of Phrynicus in 8. 27. 2 οὐδέποτε τῷ αἰσχρῷ ὄνείδει εἰξας ἀλόγως

*διακινδυνεύσειν.* Cf. also 1. 77. 2 οὐδεὶς σκοπεῖ αὐτῶν τοῖς . . . ἀρχὴν ἔχουσι . . . διότι τοῦτο οὐκ ὄντειδίζεται, where the persons come first in the dative, and the verb of reproach follows later. But the dative *ἥσσθεῖσι* following *ἐπεσπάσατο* seems impossible, and I would therefore move the latter, say to come after *ἔκόντας* in the next line, or make some other change in the order of words.

*αἰσχροῖς . . . κινδύνοις* above is an odd expression, and *ἔσχάτοις* has been substituted. *αἰσχροῖς* seems to come from *αἰσχρόν* here, *αἰσχύνη* helping.

## BOOK VI.

1. 1. Should we read *ἔβουλεύοντο* for *ἔβούλοντο*? (cf. however 6. 1). The words are often confused, as critical notes will show, e.g. 3. 43. 2, 6. 54. 4, 7. 72. 2, 8. 92. 5. *ἔβουλενόμην* takes an infinitive in 5. 8. 1. Cf. Ar. *Peace* 58, 231, etc. Make perhaps the same change in 3. 3. 1.

ib. 2. The *οὖσα* of MSS. is only a reproduction of the *οὖσα* two lines above.

3. 1. *Βωμὸν ὅστις νῦν ἔξω τῆς πόλεώς ἐστιν.*

The use of *ὅστις* is not Attic, and it is an idle fancy that Thucydides took it over from Antiochus. Probably *ὅστις* is merely a mistake for *ὅσπερ*. Thus in Aesch. *P.V.* 822 *ἥνπερ* is a certain correction (Hermann) of *ἥντιν'*, and ib. 609 the MSS. have *ὅτι* against *ὅπερ* in the *Etym. Magn.* *Phaedo* 59 E *ὅσπερ* is undoubted, but we have some evidence for *ὅστις*. Soph. *O.T.* 1054 *ὅντιν'* looks like an error for *ὅνπερ*: cf. 1120. For *βωμὸς ὅσπερ*, *an altar, the very one which*, cf. 7. 4. 4, 7. 29. 5, etc.

6. 2. Perhaps <*διὰ*> *Λεοντίνων*. This seems more likely than that Λ. should be simply omitted.

7. 1. *σήτον ἀνεκομίσαντό τινα ζεύγη κομίσαντες.*

Either the verb or the participle is a slip of the pen for some other word. Thucydides would not use *κομίζω* twice.

8. 3. There should be no stop after *προσδέοιντο*. *ψηφισθῆναι* is explanatory.

10. 4. *μετὰ Σικελιωτῶν οὓς πρὸ πολλῶν ἀν ἐτιμήσαντο ξυμμάχους γενέσθαι.*

Probably *πρὸ πολλοῦ*, the plural ending being due to that of *Σικελιωτῶν*. So in 8. 2 *τοῖς κοωοῖς* is due to *τοῖς ἱεροῖς*. If *πολλῶν* is right, we must add *χρημάτων* after *ἄν*, as in 1. 33. 2.

11. 2. Σ. δ' *ἄν μοι δοκοῦσιν*, *ὡς γε νῦν ἔχουσι*, *καὶ ἔτι ἥσσον ἀν δεινοὶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι, εἰ κ.τ.λ.*

Much difficulty has been found here. The real solution, I think, is to read *οὐ* for *ἄν* before *μοι*. *δεινοί εἰναι* is then easily understood from the following words.

In Plutarch *adv. Colot.* 1123 D *ἴσμεν . . . μᾶλλον ἀν οἷς οὐ παρατυγχάνουσιν διαπιστήσαντας ἀνθρώπους . . . ἡ μίαν ἐκείνων ἀληθῆ . . . εἶναι φαντασίαν πεισθέντας* I think we should read *οἷς ἀν παρατυγχάνωσιν*.

ib. 4. <μάλιστα> after *πλείστου*, as in 4. 115. 3?

12. 1. εἴη ἀν for εἶναι? The confusion occurs elsewhere.

ib. 2. For *νεωτέρῳ* read *νεωτέρων* with Stein and Badham. The construction will be easier if we put εἶναι after it, not after μέγα. Οὐδὲ calls for a plural. Instead of τῷ αὐτῷ following (13. 1) we certainly need τοιούτῳ. (So too, I find, Badham.) There is little or no point in *the same*.

13. 1. In the speech of Alcibiades (16–18) Thucydides makes him twice refer to his supposed ἄνοια in a way that is hardly intelligible, unless Nicias in the preceding speech has imputed it to him. The passages are 16. 3, where ήδ' η ἄνοια is certainly right, and 17. 1 ή ἐμὴ νεότης καὶ ἄνοια. The repetition of the word points plainly to something in Nicias' speech. Yet in that speech itself there is nothing said on the subject and the word does not occur. The editors offer no explanation of this: indeed they do not even notice it.

In 13. 1 Nicias bids the older men not be shamefaced before the younger μηδ', ὅπερ ἀν αὐτοὶ πάθοιεν, δυσέρωτας εἶναι τῶν ἀτόντων. Some say that αὐτοὶ means *of themselves*, without encouragement from Alcibiades and his friends; others refer it to these younger, not to the elder, men. Either explanation is forced and weak. Others again read οὐτοὶ. Can it be that ὅπερ ἀν αὐτοὶ represents ὅπερ ἀν ἀνόητοι, the double *an* helping the mistake? In the text of the *Meno* the name "Ανντος appears two or three times as αὐτός, and so 'Αθ. Πολ. 27 (end), but this is an easier corruption. Even ἀνόητοι however would contain no specific reference to Alcibiades.

16. 2. In relation to the display at Olympia ἐκ τοῦ ὄρωμένου seems a probable correction of ἐκ τοῦ δρωμένου. So τὸ διαπρεπές before. The two words are apt to get confused: cf. Cobet *V.L.* 448–9. τὸ δράμενον occurs however in 5. 102.

ib. 5. καταλιπόντας should be καταλείποντας to match οὗτας and ξυνόντας.

18. 2. καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ὅσοι δὴ ἄλλοι ἥρξαν.

ἥρξαν alone is odd. ὅσοι ηδη, before now?

ib. 3. ἐπασκητέον for ἐπισκεπτέον, which seems hardly in place here? Neither verb is used by Thucydides elsewhere.

ib. 6. κόσμῳ φέρε?

21. 2. ἐκ γῆς φιλίας?

22 (end). λόγῳ δή (for ἀν)?

31. 4. Insert ἀν after μᾶλλον. εἰκασθῆναι does not mean *represented, portrayed*, a sense which is here unsuitable. It means that as regards or in the eyes of (ἐς) the other Greeks the expedition might have seemed or been taken to be a display rather than a force gathered for actual war. Cf. 1. 10. 2 διπλασίαν . . . ἀν εἰκάζεσθαι.

33. 6. τὸ τοιοῦτο can hardly be right. Either τι τοιοῦτο or (better) τὸ αὐτό seems needed.

34. 5. τήν τε ἄλλην παρασκευὴν ἀπολείποιεν ἀν καὶ τὰ τῶν πόλεων οὐκ ἀν βέβαια ἔχοντες εἰ ὑποδέξοιντο ἀθυμοῖεν.

Since *οὐκ* has nothing to do with the verb, is it right that *ἄν* should stand immediately after it? For *οὐκ ἄν* I conjecture *οὐ πάνυ*.

*ib.* 9. Instead of *τολμήσαντες* we seem to want an infinitive parallel to *έτοιμάζειν*. The participle is probably an inadvertent repetition of *τολμήσαντας* just above, and we have therefore nothing to guide us with any certainty. *τολμῆσαι* would do, but it may be some quite different word. *τολμήσαντες* with an infinitive added is also possible.

35. 1. *ἄ λέγεται, οἱ δέ* (Madvig) may well be right. Possibly *ἄ λέγει τις, οἱ δέ*.

36. 1. *οὗτῳ κακῶς φρονῆσαι <ώστε> καὶ?*

*ib.* 2. *οἱ γὰρ <ἀεὶ> δεδιότες? καὶ νῦν* in particular calls for such an addition.

46. 3. *οἱ γὰρ Ἐγ.,* not *οἱ δέ*. Cf. on 89. 2.

49. 4. *ἐφορμήσαντας* (from *ἐφορμεῖν*)?

53. 3. *οὐδὲν ὑφ' ἔαντῶν καὶ Ἀρμοδίου καταλυθεῖσαν.*

Is there any reason for ignoring Aristogeiton? 56. 2 (first words: cf. Ar. *Pol.* 8. 10. 1311 a 38) does not seem justification enough. Cf. 54. 1, 59. 1, and add *καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος*.

54. 3. Omit *τοῦ Πεισιστράτου*.

55. 2. *ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ στήλῃ* (Valla's translation implying *αὐτῇ*).

64. 1. *τοὺς γὰρ ἀν ψιλοὺς τοὺς σφῶν . . . τοὺς ἵππεας βλάπτειν ἀν μεγάλα.*

A very unusual position for *ἄν* (but cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 512). *τοὺς γὰρ δή?*

72. 4. *ταῦτα* for *αὐτά?* What follows is against their being said to 'grow of themselves.'

76. 4. *ἐπὶ δεσπότου μεταβολῇ* (*substitution*) *οὐκ ἀξινετωτέρου, κακοξινετωτέρου δέ.*

There will be a better point if, assuming the very common confusion of *ἀ-* and *εὐ-* (cf. on 79. 2), we read *εὐξινετωτέρου*, a word which occurs in 4. 18. 4. *εὐ-* and *κακο-* are then directly opposed with a sort of play on the senses of *εὐ*.

78. 2. *τὸν αὐτόν* is not quite the right expression, for no one whatever can control chance; but no doubt it is what Thucydides wrote.

*ib.* 3. *τοῖς αὐτοῦ κακοῖς ὀλοφυρθεῖς.*

*δλ.* is best taken as passive, *lamented, pitied*, i.e. *in trouble*. Cf. 2. 44. 1 *τοὺς τοκέας . . . οὐκ ὀλοφύρομαι* (or *-οῦμαι*) *μᾶλλον ἢ παραμνήσομαι*, the parents being *τοῖς κακοῖς οὐκ ὀλοφυρθέντες* by Pericles. If it were the middle, we should naturally have had the accusative, *τὰ κακά. κακοῖς* is dative of cause, as in Eur. *Or.* 386 *οὐ γὰρ ξῶ κακοῖς*.

*ibid.* *σώζοι . . . τὴν αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν* is surely an impossible phrase. Perhaps *ἔλευθερίαν*: cf. 76. 4, 2. 62. 3, etc. *σωτηρίαν* is due to *σώζοι* being in the writer's mind: cf. on 34. 9. Or is it *σώζοι* that is wrong?

79. 2. For the obscure *ἀλόγως* and *εὐλόγῳ* read *εὐλόγως* and *ἀλόγῳ*. Everything then is clear. Cf. on 76. 4.

80. 5. *κάν* should probably be *καί*, though the mistake is certainly oftener the other way.

82. 4. *δουλείαν . . . ἐβούλοντο*. Cf. Ar. *Pol.* 8. 9. 1309 b 17 *τὸ βουλόμενον τὴν πολιτείαν πλήθος*, *ibid.* 1310 a 21 *οἱ δημοκρατίαν βουλόμενοι*, and elsewhere.

83. 1. Perhaps *ταῦτὸ* (for *τοῦτο*) *δρῶντες* would be better.

85. 3. <*τὸ*> *ἐς Σ. δέος* seems needed.

87. 3. *καθ' ὅσον τι ὑμῖν τῆς ἡμετέρας πολυπραγμοσύνης καὶ τρόπου τὸ αὐτὸ ξυμφέρει*.

*τὸ αὐτό*, as usually explained, would certainly call for a *καί* before *ὑμῖν* (as in 83. 2), and in default of that we try to connect it with the *καί* introducing *τρόπου*. *τρόπου* again by itself is oddly added to *πολυπραγμοσύνης*. Should we read *καὶ τρόπου τοιούτου*? Cf. 7. 50. 4 *θειασμῷ τε καὶ τῷ τοιούτῳ προσκείμενος*: 87. 2 *διὰ τὴν μεταβολὴν καὶ τὸ τοιούτον ἀπέθνησκον*. See above on 12. 2. In 68. 1 the same change seems needed, and the reverse in 7. 78. 1.

In 4 I would adopt the conjecture *ἀδεές*, comparing Dem. 16. 22 *οὐ γάρ ἔγωγε ἀδεές τοῦθ' ὑπολαμβάνω τῇ πόλει*.

89. 2. *τὸν γάρ* (for *δὲ*) *ἔμων*? Cf. on 46. 3.

91. 4. *ώς ἀν . . . ξυντάξῃ* here and *ὅπως ἀν ἀπολισθάνοι* in 7. 65. 2 are probably right, though each is in its way a construction unique for Thucydides. But it would be easy to read *ὅς δὴ ξυντάξει* and *ὅπως δή*. *Od.* 19. 290 *οἱ δὴ μν πέμψουσι κ.τ.λ.*

*ib.* 7. If *δικαστηρίων* is wrong (*ἐργαστηρίων* being a plausible conjecture), it is a curious coincidence that the word is wrong also in Lysias 31. 1, where *βουλευτήριον* is restored in its place.

After *μάλιστα δέ* should we insert a verb, e.g. *βλάψονται* or *κωλύσονται*? It is not likely that *ἀποστερήσονται* should take first an accusative and then a genitive. Cf. 1. 142. 2 *μέγιστον δὲ τῷ τῶν χρημάτων σπάνει κωλύσονται*, and *κωλύσετε* occurs here a few lines above.

## BOOK VII.

1. 3. *τὰς γάρ* B, *τὰς μέν* all other MSS. *τὰς μὲν γάρ* would be very suitable. Cf. 55. 1, etc.

3. 3. See on 5. 16. 2.

13. 2. *ἐπ' αὐτομολίας προφάσει* has been much discussed and copiously emended. Has it been suggested that *αὐτομολίας* may refer not to the men themselves (*οἱ μέν . . . ἀπέρχονται*) but to their slaves? Only five lines above Nicias has said *οἱ θεράποντες . . . αὐτομολοῦσι*, and he may mean now that this gave masters an excuse for going in real or pretended pursuit of them. For a precisely similar use of *αὐτομολία* without slaves being specified cf. 1. 142. 4 *τῆς μὲν γῆς βλάπτουεν ἀν τι μέρος καταδρομᾶις καὶ αὐτομολίας*, where the enemy overrun and the slaves run away. Consider also 7. 27. 5.

We are reminded of Plat. *Prot.* 310 c ὁ γάρ τοι παῖς με ὁ Σάτυρος ἀπέδρα,  
καὶ δῆτα μέλλων σοι φράξειν διτὶ διωξίμην αὐτὸν . . . ἐπελαθόμην.

25. 1. πρέσβεις ἄγονσα οἴπερ . . . φράσονσιν is not good Greek. ὃς and  
ὅστις are so used, never ὅσπερ. We must therefore either read one of these  
other pronouns (cf. on 6. 3. 1) or adopt B's ὅπως.

ib. 7. μή . . . ὥσπερ περὶ ἔρμα περιβάλῃ τὴν ναῦν. Surely προσβάλῃ.  
περὶ is probably due to περὶ ἔρμα. προσβάλλειν is the regular word. Aesch.  
*Eum.* 564. τὸν πρὶν ὅλβον ἔρματι προσβαλὼν δίκας, etc. περιβάλλειν κακοῖς,  
etc., is quite different.

27. 4. τῆς ἵσης φουρᾶς is an odd expression, but I am not quite convinced  
of its being wrong. ἵση φουρά will be a garrison kept at the same strength,  
uniform and equal, in contrast with the πλέονες just mentioned. Steup demurs  
also to ἐξ ἀνάγκης, because the garrison cannot have depended for supplies on  
the plunder of devastated land; but the word ληστείας surely confirms it.

28. 2. <τὴν φυλακὴν> ποιούμενοι? cf. Steup. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι might well  
be omitted.

ib. 3. τὸ γάρ is clearly wrong, and Marchant's τό γ' ἀν much the most  
satisfactory correction, the ἀν being due of course to πρὶν γενέσθαι ἡπίστησεν  
ἀν. τό γ' ἀν κ.τ.λ. is in apposition to and in explanation of φιλονικίαν τοιαύτην  
ἢν . . . ἀκούσας: cf. 36. 5. 1. 32. 4, etc. τοιαύτην should, I think, be  
τοσαύτην: cf. on 8. 66. 2. So in 7. 69. 2 οὗτος has been corrected to ὅσος. A  
few lines below we have two more difficulties, one the ὅσον which cannot  
really be joined with τοσοῦτον, because of ὥστε following, and the other οἱ δὲ  
κ.τ.λ. ὅσον is probably a mistake for ὀν, referring to τοῦς Ἑλλησι. Confusion  
of parts of ὃς and ὅσος is common. Cf. for instance Xen. *Hell.* 1. 3. 9 ὑποτε-  
λεῖν τὸν φόρον . . . ὅσονπερ εἰώθεσαν, where a papyrus fragment gives ὠνπερ  
(sic), and Plat. *Phaedo* 83 c where MSS. vary between ὅσον and ὀν, and on  
4. 55. 1 above. Reading ὀν here, we have ὀν κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ πολέμου οἱ μὲν  
ἐνιαυτόν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τριῶν γε ἐτῶν οὐδεὶς πλείω χρόνον ἐνόμιζον περιοίσειν  
αὐτούς, in which there must be something very wrong with the last clause.  
The best correction is Herwerden's οὐ δή for οὐδεὶς, but it is not quite right.  
We should indeed read οὐ δή, but in the place of οἱ δέ, not of οὐδεὶς: 'some  
thought they would hold out for a year, some for two, not assuredly for more  
than three anyone.' ἐνόμιζον must be changed to ἐνόμιζε(ν): the number was  
of course accommodated to the false οἱ δέ.

29. 5. <ἄλλὰ> μᾶλλον or μᾶλλον <δέ>?

30. 2. οὐκ ἀτόπως is used in a sense, not badly, probably unique in our  
Attic. Cf. however D. Hal. 477 and 480 (*Lysias* 12) and elsewhere.

31. 1. ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ?

ib. 4. αἱ νῆσεις . . . οὔτε καταλύοντι τὸν πόλεμον ναυμαχεῖν τε μέλλονσιν.

πόλεμον is ludicrous, but no good correction has been found. πόνος is a  
word for which it sometimes gets substituted (see Herod. 6. 114 (Aldine),  
Heliod. 2. 22., and two examples in Cobet *ad D. Hal.* p. 68), and which would  
give excellent sense here. Cf. on 8. 94. 3. The labour of keeping perpetual

watch on other ships was no doubt great, especially by night, as in 2. 83. 3, or 8. 102. 2. Cf. 3. 33. 3. Eur. *Phoen.* 1409 ἔξαλλαγεις γὰρ τοῦ παρεστῶτος πόνου illustrates the use of πόνος. φυλακὴν καταλύειν was a familiar phrase (*Wasps* 2, *Politics* 8. 8. 1308 a 29), and this was a φυλακή.

48. 3. καὶ γὰρ οὐ τοὺς αὐτὸὺς κ.τ.λ. Cf. Dem. 4. 47.

49. 3. ταῦτά, not ταῦτα.

51. 1. μὴ ἀνιέναι τὰ τῶν 'Α., ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν κατεγνωκότων ἥδη μηκέτι κρεισσόνων εἶναι σφῶν.

κατεγνωκότων wants an object. Read therefore αὐτῶν, comparing 3. 45. 1 καταγνοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μὴ περιέσθαι.

56. 4. τῶν for τοῦ after λόγου, i.e. τῶν ξυνελθόντων? For ξύμπαντος λόγου cf. Soph. *O.C.* 1225.

61. 1. ὁ μὲν ἀγὼν <ἡμῖν> ὁ μέλλων? The antithesis requires that ἡμῖν be expressed.

63. 4. Read δή for ἄν, δικαίως δὴ αὐτὴν νῦν μὴ καταπροδίδοτε. δικαίως qualifies the whole negative expression adverbially. Cf. 8. 46. 5 καταφανέστερον . . . οὐ προθύμως ξυνεπολέμει: *Crito*, 44 A κινδυνεύεις ἐν καιρῷ τινι οὐκ ἐγείραι με: *Phaedo* 69 B εἰκότως . . . οὐ χαλεπώς φέρω and 116 B ταῦτα εἰκότως οὐ ποιήσω, 95 B ἀτόπως ἔδοξεν . . . οὐ δέξασθαι: *Theaet.* 177 B ἀτόπως . . . οὐκ ἀρέσκουσιν αὐτοὶ αὐτοῖς, 210 C σωφρόνως οὐκ οἰόμενος εἰδέναι: *Rep.* 605 B οὗτος ἥδη ἂν ἐν δίκῃ οὐ παραδεχοίμεθα: *Ar. An.* 139 καλῶς . . . οὐκ ἔκυσας: *Dem.* 22. 42 πολλὰ χρήματα' ἀναιδῶς οὐ τιθέντας: *Od.* 14. 196 ρῆσδις κεν ἔπειτα . . . οὐ τι διαπρήξαιμι: *Ar. Pol.* 7. 7. 1321 a 33 ἵνα ἐκὼν ὁ δῆμος μὴ μετέχῃ.

66. 3. τῷ ruins the symmetry of παρ' ἐλπίδα τοῦ αὐχήματος and παρ' ἰσχὺν τῆς διανοίας. M. has τό, and it may be a mere repetition of τό which occurs twice just before. It may also conceivably represent τούτῳ, meant to stand before κολονθώσι.

75. 4. In οὐκ ἀνεν ὀδίγων ἐπιθειασμῶν it seems most likely that ὀδίγων is a mistake for πολλῶν, as has been suggested. In Xen. *Symp.* 4. 37 I have pointed out a clear case of the same confusion (though there it may be due to πολλά occurring twice just before); 'Αθ. Πολ. 18. 2 may be another. In Ar. *Rhet.* 1. 2. 1356 b 13 there seems to be an old variant ὀδίγων for πολλῶν. But it is also possible that Thucydides wrote in the next line ὀδίγουν πᾶν τὸ στράτευμα, and that ὀδίγουν, getting out of its place, was changed to ὀδίγων. ὀδίγουν is so used in 4. 124. 1, 8. 35. 3.

*ibid.* δάκρυσι πᾶν τὸ στράτευμα πλησθὲν καὶ ἀπορίᾳ τοιαύτῃ μὴ ράδιως ἀφορμᾶσθαι.

κατ' ἀπορίαν τοιαύτην? Cf. my suggestion on *Plat. Rep.* 405 B (*Platonica*, p. 98).

*ib.* 6. καὶ μὴν ἡ ἄλλη αἰκία καὶ ἡ ἴσομοιρία τῶν κακῶν ἔχουσά τινα ὅμως τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν κονφίσιν, οὐδέ ὡς ράδια ἐν τῷ παρόντι ἔδοξάζετο.

ἡ ἄλλη does not make much sense, for the situation has been pretty comprehensively stated, and the point of 6 applies as much to what is described in 5 as to anything else. ἡ ἴσομοιρία again cannot mean the universality, and is

not fit to be coupled with *ἡ αἰκία*. *ἡ i.* could not be relieved by *τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν*, for to all intents and purposes it is just *τὸ μετὰ πολλῶν* itself, the same thing in one word. Did Thucydides write something like *καὶ μὴν ἡ ὅλη αἰκία ἔχουσά τινα ὅμως τῷ μετὰ πολλῶν καὶ τῇ ἴσομοιρίᾳ τῶν κακῶν κούφισιν*, or *τό* and *τὴν ἴσομοιρίαν*? There are many cases of the confusion of *ἄλλος* and *ὅλος*. The use of *αἰκία* here is well paralleled by Soph. *O.C.* 748.

77. 3. *αἱ δὲ ξυμφοραὶ οὐ κατ' ἀξίαν δὴ φοβοῦσιν.*

*οὐ κατ'* *ἀ.* cannot mean *being undeserved* or *our undeserved misfortunes*. The resemblance to *ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν νῦν κακοπαθίαις* is merely accidental. If too that were the sense, this clause should have come first with *μέν* and *ἡ ἐλπίς . . . τοῦ μέλλοντος* second with *δέ*. The necessary and quite good meaning is that their troubles do not alarm him as much as in a sense they ought; he has more confidence that things will improve than the situation exactly justifies or may be thought to justify. The phrase is slightly paradoxical.

78. 1. Read *ταύτα* for *τοιαῦτα*. Cf. on 6. 87. 3. In 1. 131. 1 Dobree's *ταύτα* seems necessary.

80. 4. *ώσπερ ἥγειτο* is rather odd. *φπερ, with which he was leading?* Dobree *όπερ* or *όσπερ*.

83. 4. *καὶ <ἄμα>* *ἀναλαμβάνοντι κ.τ.λ.*? *ἄμα* seems necessary to the sense and would easily be lost before *ἀνα-*. Cf. Dem. 18. 32 *ἄλλ' ἄμ' ἀκούοντε κ.τ.λ.* and very many other passages.

84. 3. *δή* for *ἥδη*? *H* may be due to *N* preceding.

86. 3. The construction would be easier if we read *πεῖσαι* for *πείσας*, though three infinitives are rather heavy.

ib. 5. *τὴν πᾶσαν ἐς ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην ἐπιτήδευσιν.*

Those who think that in these well-known words *νενομισμένην* can mean 'practised by Nicias' overlook the fact that *νομίζω* in this sense, like *νόμος*, never refers to a single person, but always to a community of some kind. It is only when the word means *think* that it can be used of an individual. *νενομισμένην* therefore agrees with *ἀρετήν*. Nicias' whole way of living was directed to and by *ἀρετὴν νενομισμένην*, what opinion and usage declared to be excellence.

87. 4. Probably *χαλεποί*. Cf. 14. 2 *χαλεπαί . . . φύσεις ἄρξαι*: I. 20. 1 *τὰ παλαιά . . . χαλεπὰ ὄντα . . . πιστεῦσαι*: I. 1. 3 *σαφῶς εὑρεῖν . . . ἀδύνατα*. But *χαλεπόν* may be right.

## BOOK VIII.

I. 2. *όπλιτῶν τε πολλῶν καὶ ἵππεων καὶ ἥλικίας οἵαν κ.τ.λ.*

Omit the second *καὶ* (as though the *ἥλικία* were quite distinct from hoplites and horse), comparing 7. 64. 1 *οὔτε ναῦς . . . ἄλλας . . . οὔτε ὄπλιτῶν ἥλικίαν*. Or *καὶ <ἄλλης> ἥλικίας*?

*έώρων* and *όρωντες* so close together are somewhat suspicious. One may

have grown out of the other, e.g. ὄρῶντες from an original ἔχοντες. Cf. however Ar. Pol. 6. 7. 1321 a 37-39.

7. 1. Read ἐπειγόντων. The improper form ἐπειγομένων is due to ἐπιγυγομένου just preceding.

8. 1. With ὑπὲρ τοῦ Φ. should not a participle be introduced, e.g. ἀντιλέγοντες? Cf. 45. 4 ἀντιλέγων ὑπὲρ τοῦ Τ.?

ib. 4. καταφρονήσαντες τῶν 'Α. ἀδυνασίαν seems a questionable phrase. <τὴν> τῶν? Or καταφρονήσαντες <καὶ καταγνόντες> τῶν? Cf. Xen. Hell. I. 7. 33 προδοσίαν καταγνόντες ἀντὶ τῆς ἀδυναμίας.

27. 2. I am inclined to think that ἔξεστιν and ἔσται are both right, and that with the latter there stood originally something like ἡ μάχη.

46. 2. εὐτελέστερα δὲ τάδ' εἶναι Madvig for τὰ δεινά. Has it been noticed that in Dem. 22. 61 the reverse mistake is made by S and other MSS., which give τόδ' εἶναι against the necessary τὸ δεῖνα of A?

εὐτελέστερα hardly makes sense, and Herwerden's λυσιτελέστερα is probable.

ib. 5. τὰς Φοινίσσας φάσκων ναῦς ἥξειν.

Perhaps ἕξειν. Cf. 46. 1, 59, 78, 81. 3, 87. 2, 88.

48. 4. εὕπορον (εὔλογον Naber) perhaps due to εὕπορα above and εὕπορον in 3.

ib. 5. ὅποτέρας?

ib. 7. καὶ ταῦτα παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἐπισταμένας τὰς πόλεις σαφῶς αὐτὸς εἰδέναι (ἔφη) ὅτι οὕτω νομίζουσι.

παρά is only used in this way of persons or of things distinctly personified, and παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων from facts themselves can hardly be justified. Stahl περὶ αὐτῶν τῷ ἔργῳ, which is better, though not, I think, precisely right. Read rather παρ' αὐτῶν τῷ ἔργῳ ἐπιστάμενος, αὐτῶν being the states or their peoples spoken of in §§ 5, 6 (αὐτούς twice). Cf. 7. 48. 4 οὐκονν βούλεσθαι (ἔφη) αὐτός γε ἐπιστάμενος τὰς 'Α. φύσεις κ.τ.λ.

54. 2. ὅπῃ ἂν . . . ἔχειν?

56. 3. δοκεῖν ἐβούλετο . . . ως πεπεισμένω Τ. καὶ βουλομένω προσχωρῆσαι τὸν 'Α. μὴ ἵκανὰ διδόναι.

ώς gives a wrong sense, that the A. did not offer T. enough, as being (i.e. because they thought him) already persuaded and ready to join them. Clearly this was not the case. ώς and καὶ sometimes get confused (cf. on 5. 76. 3), and καὶ πεπεισμένω, though persuaded, would be better.

Alcibiades asked such high terms on T.'s behalf (the story goes on) ώστε τὸ τῶν 'Α., καίπερ ἐπὶ πολὺ ὅτι αἴτιοι ἔνυγχωρούντων, ὅμως αἴτιον γενέσθαι. Here αἴτιον can hardly be right. αἴτιον of what? Nor is it really reasonable to say that the extravagant demands of one party make the other party responsible (for the thing falling through). αἴτιον should, I think, be ἐναντίον, just as two lines below οὐκ ἐναντιούμενων τῶν 'Α. is used, not opposing the demand. In Herod. 8. 140 we have the exactly similar phrase ἦν μὴ τὸ ὑμέτερον ἀντίον γένηται, where ἀντίον is Valckenaer's correction of αἴτιον. In Diod. 19. 20. 1

one MS. has by mistake ἐναντίον for ἐν αἰτίαις. The error here was made easier by αἰτοίνι three words before.

A little below the MSS. give ἐνταῦθα δὴ οὐκέτι (ορ οὐκέτι τι) ἀλλ' ἄπορα νομίσαντες οἱ 'Α. . . . ἀπελθόντες κ.τ.λ. Hude οὐκέτι ἀλλ' ἡ ἄπορα after Madvig and Lindau. 'Post οὐκέτι paucia excidisse censeo' Stuart Jones. Comparing 7. 73. 3 ως δέ . . . ἐφαίνετο ἄπορα καὶ οὐκέτι ἔπειθεν αὐτούς, we may fairly read οὐκέτι ἔπειθεν, ἀλλ' ἄπορα κ.τ.λ. ἄπορα νομίζουντες occurs also 3. 16. 2 with no definite object.

57. 2. αὐ for the second οὖν? or is οὖν a mere duplicate?

58. 6. ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς for ἐπ' αὐτοῖς is hard to justify, unless we change Λ. δὲ καὶ τοὺς ξ. to datives. Cf. Ar. de Memor. 2. 455 a 21 καθάπερ τοῖς βάλλουσιν οὐκέτι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς τὸ στῆσαι.

60. 3. ἔώρων οὐκέτι . . . οἶόν τε εἶναι is doubtful syntax. ἔώρων <ως> οὐκέτι οἶόν τε ἀν εἴη? Cf. on 6. 12. 1.

62. 2. Is not a numeral missing after ων καὶ? (as probably in 25. 1). So too, I think, in 69. 3 with Αἰγυνητῶν and 95. 2 with ναῦς. Cf. on 5. 2. 2 above.

63. 4. ἐσκέψαντο with an infinitive is so strange that perhaps something has been lost, e.g. <καὶ ἐδόκει δέν> 'Αλκ. κ.τ.λ.

64. 1. The compound ἐγκαθιστάναι would ease the construction.

66. 2. τοσαύτην for τοιαύτην. Cf. on 7. 28. 3.

69. 1. ήσαν γάρ for ήσαν δέ?

71. 1. οὐχ ήσυχάζειν and οὐκ ἀν ήσυχάζειν are probably to be treated like the double ἔξενρεῖν in 66. 3. The first ή. is not very suitable and may have taken the place of some other word, e.g. ὄμονοεῖν. τὴν πόλιν οὐχ ήσυχάζειν, if omitted altogether, would not be missed; and it may be a case of words getting into the text twice, once in the wrong place.

Thucydides couples αὐτοβοέι with ἐλεῖν in 62. 2, 2. 81. 4, 3. 113. 6, and it may be conjectured that αὐτοβοεὶ ἀν <ἐλεῖν> should be read here.

73. 2. Read the aorist μεταβαλόμενοι.

75. 3. Cf. Herod. 2. 13. 6 ὕδατος ἀποστροφή.

86. 3. τῶν πεντακισχιλίων πάντες is not good Greek; τῶν π. μετέχειν is doubtful Greek and bad sense. Perhaps something like τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων ὅτι οἱ πεντακισχιλοὶ πάντες . . . μεθέξουσιν. In Ar. Pol. 6. 3. 1290 a 4 the genitive is really due to ἐλάττω and πλείω.

ib. 4. καὶ δοκεῖ 'Α. πρῶτον τότε καὶ οὐδενὸς ἐλασσον τὴν πόλιν ὠφελῆσαι.

As this could hardly be called the first time (6. 15. 4 and foll. chh.), and as καὶ οὐδ. ἔλ. is added somewhat oddly, there is probably something wrong. δοκεῖ 'Α. πρότερον τε καὶ τότε οὐδ. ἔλ.? πρῶτος and πρότερος are constantly confused.

89. 3. οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄμοίων ἐλασσούμενος.

Agreeing with the contention in Grote's long note that τῶν ὄμοίων is masculine, and that the people at large, not the δλίγοι and δμοιοι, are said to be responsible in a democracy for one of this class being defeated, I draw the conclusion that ἀπό ought to be ὑπό. ὑπὸ τῶν ὄμοίων does not refer to

successful rivals, but to the whole body which selects, for even in a democracy the competitors themselves may all belong to 'the few.'

90. 4. *τὸν* has been suggested for *τὸν* (*ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι*), and rightly, I think; but *αὐτοῦ* should be read too for *αὐτόν*, i.e. *ἐπ' αὐτοῖν γὰρ τοῖν . . . τὸν ἔτερον.*

92. 9. *τῷ ἀληθεῖ* is clearly right, not *τῷ πλήθει*. Cf. *τῷ εἰκότι* 6. 18. 4, perhaps *τῷ ἀσφαλεῖ* 5. 7. 3.

*ib. II.* *εἶναι* might be added to *ἄν*, which certainly cannot stand alone.

94. 3. *ὡς τοῦ ἴδιου πολέμου μείζονος [ἢ]* ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων οὐχ ἕκας ἀλλὰ πρὸς τῷ λιμένι ὄντος.

The scholiast condemns *ἢ*. *ἴδιος πόλεμος* can hardly be right, for the word *πόλεμος* is not applicable to the *στάσις* then existing at Athens. This involved no fighting and did not amount to civil 'war'; *πόλεμος* moreover always means war with foreigners.

Here, as in 7. 31. 4 (see above), I think *πόνου* should be read for *πολέμου*. An *ἴδιος πόνος* would be one with which nobody but the Athenians had anything to do, e.g. civil strife; a *πόνος ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων*, e.g. an attack on the Piraeus, would not be *ἴδιος* in this sense, because a foreign enemy brought it about—to say nothing of the fact that it was a *πόνος* for the foreign enemy too.

If we liked to alter the order of words, we could retain *ἢ* by reading *ὡς μείζονος ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ἢ τοῦ ἴδιου πόνου*, the genitive after *ἢ* being right by the usual attraction. Cf. however 1. 136. 4 *ὑπ' ἐκείνου πολλῷ ἀσθενεστέρου*. The omission of *ἢ* is better.

96. 4. *ὅπερ δή* (for *ἄν*)?

101. 2. The cause of the erroneous *περαιοῦνται* seems to be *ἀντιπέρας* adjoining.

104. 5. For *ἀσθενέστι* read *ἀσθενεῖ*, agreeing with *τῷ μέσῳ*.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

## THEOCRITEA.

i. 109.

ώραιος χόδωνις ἐπεὶ καὶ μῆλα νομεύει  
καὶ πτῶκας βάλλει καὶ θηρία πάντα διώκει.

Daphnis has taunted Aphrodite with Anchises; he goes on to Adonis as a still greater disgrace. ‘Fair is Adonis also, though he is only a shepherd, not even an oxherd.’ *ἐπεὶ* is common enough in this sense in latish writers, or we may supply an ellipse: ‘I mention Adonis, because——’ Then the reference to his hunting is also intended to vex her; Daphnis speaks ironically, as if he did not know that Adonis was killed while hunting.

J. H. Voss and Wüstemann think the whole clause to be ironical, which seems impossible.

i. 139. ἔβα ρόον. See C.Q. for July, pp. 176 sqq. I have always thought that *ρόον* must here stand for *κατὰ ρόον*, perhaps a bit of nautical slang, like *πρύμναν* for *ἐπὶ πρύμναν*. (Cf. schol. Thuc. i. 50). “He gave up struggling and drifted down stream to death.”

ii. 140.

καὶ ταχὺ χρὼς ἐπὶ χρωτὶ πεπαίνετο, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα  
θερμότερ' ήσ η πρόσθε.

‘Were hotter than before!’ What a thing to say! Their faces were hotter than fire, *θερμότερον πυρὸς ἥθε*. Cf. xiv. 23, *εὐμαρέως κεν ἀπ' αὐτᾶς καὶ λύχνον ἀψας*.

*θερμοτέρως* were nearer the tradition, but comparative adverbs in *-ως* are not, I believe, used in hexameter verse.

xii. 24.

ψεύδεα ρινὸς ὑπερθεν ἀραιῆς οὐκ ἀναφύσω.

Qu. *φυσκία*, diminutive of *φύσκη*, a blister? Cf. Romeo and Juliet, III. ii. 90, ‘Blistered be thy tongue for such a wish.’

xxii. 66.

πνυγάχος, ή καὶ ποσοὶ θένων σκέλος; ὅμματα δ' ὄρθια.

The last three words are unintelligible, and the MSS. give two readings, *ὄρθια* and *ὄρθος*. Pollux asks whether he is to fight with fists only, or whether it is to be a contest in which you may use the feet as well, and then goes on to say something about the eyes. There is only one thing he could ask about them, whether gouging is to be permitted. The technical term for this is *ὄρύσσειν*. Must not Theocritus then have written *ὅμματ' ὄρύσσων*? (*ὅμμα τ'* or *δ'* if you prefer it).

If he did, one can only suppose that the last five letters of the line were

lost altogether. ὄρθός, which looks an honester reading than ὄρθά, may be an attempt at deciphering an almost obliterated original.

I do not think Wilamowitz is right in reading θένω, but if he is we must substitute ὄρύσσω or ὄρύξω for the participle.

xxiii. 41. καν νεκρῷ χάρισαι τὰ σὰ χείλεα. μή με φοβαθῆς·  
οὐ δύναμαι εἴν σε, διαλλάξεις με φιλάσσεις.

Read surely οὐ δύναμαι δάκνειν (or δακέειν) σε. The sentiment is half pathetic, half jocose. ‘You needn’t be afraid, I can’t bite you; and it will stop my anger.’ It is a reference, too, to the saying νεκρὸς οὐ δάκνει (Plut. *Pompeius*, 77 ad fin.). Cf. also xii. 25.

xxvii. 60. ἄλλην ἀμπεχόνην τῆς σῆς τοι μείζονα δώσω.  
μείζονα is absurd; read τοι ἀμείνονα or τάμείνονα.

ARTHUR PLATT.

## BOETHVS OF SIDON.

THE study of post-Aristotelian philosophy is constantly confused by the perplexing way in which the names of philosophers recur. Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, is sufficiently well known not to be confused with either Zeno the Eleatic or the later Stoic, Zeno of Tarsus, a disciple of Chrysippus; but when we come to less distinguished names the opportunity of error is greater. If two philosophers of the same name are prominent members of different schools, there ought to be no obscurity, but in an age of eclecticism one school will sometimes adopt doctrines from another, and so make classification difficult.

The case of Boethus is perplexing, firstly, because there were several philosophers of that name; secondly, because the two best known seem both to have been natives of Sidon; thirdly, because of these two the Stoic grafted Peripatetic doctrine on to his system. As famous an authority as Zeller was either confused about the name, or did not succeed in explaining his views clearly.<sup>1</sup>

In the English edition (*Eclectics*, 1883), the index separates Boethus from Boethus of Sidon, implying that Boethus the Stoic and Boethus Sidonius the Peripatetic are distinct persons, but in *op. cit.* p. 35 we read, 'We know that he (i.e. the Stoic) . . . approximated to the Peripatetic doctrine, so as to imperil the purity of his Stoicism.' As no dates are given, the reader might be led into supposing that the philosopher here mentioned is identical with the one who is described later as a Peripatetic; and though the index separates the two, its omission of the title Sidonius in the former case tacitly implies that the words 'of Sidon' are enough to distinguish the Peripatetic, as belonging to him only.

It is, however, generally believed that the Stoic as well was a native of Sidon. This supposition is based first on a passage in [Philo], *περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου*, § 10, p. 497, which refers to Βόηθος ὁ Σιδώνιος καὶ Παναίτιος as distinguished leaders of Stoicism who denied the theory of the conflagration of the world.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Zeller, *Ph. d. Gr.* III. I. 46. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Bock attached great importance to this passage owing to the vulgate reading current in his time, Βόηθος γοῦν καὶ Ποσιδώνιος καὶ Παναίτιος, ἄνδρες ἐν τοῖς Στωϊκοῖς δόγμασι ἴσχυκτες, ἄντεθλητοι δύντες, πρὸς θειότερον δύγμα τῆς ἀφθαρτοῦ

τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ηὔρουβλησαν. But καὶ Ποσιδώνιος proves to have been an attempt of Turnebus to restore a corrupt MS. reading, and Bernays recovered from the Medicean the now generally accepted ὁ Σιδώνιος.

Diels, however, has completely shattered the reputation of the pseudo-Philo, the author of this treatise, whom he impolitely terms a *nebulo*.<sup>1</sup> Further evidence is therefore required.

The second alleged reference is in the *Life of Aratus*, Buhl's *Aratus*, vol. 2, p. 443. Βόηθος δὲ ὁ Σιδώνιος ἐν τῷ α' περὶ αὐτοῦ φησιν οὐχ Ἡσιόδου ἀλλὰ Ὁμήρου ζηλωτὴν γεγονέναι. This Boethus is not here called a Stoic, and from an isolated sentence of literary criticism we cannot judge of a man's philosophical opinions; so that this passage is inconclusive, even though the life of Aratus may be of respectable antiquity and authority;<sup>2</sup> and even if it is derived from Geminus, the chronology of Geminus' life is uncertain, and Boethus the Peripatetic, the fellow-student of Strabo, may have been writing in his lifetime.

The last and most important reference is in the *Index Herculaneum*, Col. LI. Lines 7-9 are thus printed by Comparetti:<sup>3</sup>

ος. Ἀπολλοδ(ω)[ρος Σελευ  
(κ)ε(ν)[ς] ἀπο (Τ)[νυριος Βοη  
θος (Σ)εδ(ω)[νιος . . .

where [ ] indicates the conjectural filling up of lacunae, ( ) letters which are incomplete or of which only some traces remain.

If we restrict ourselves to the letters about which there was no doubt in Comparetti's mind, we have remaining only θος. ιδ . . . as the name of a head, or possibly two heads, of the Stoic School, who succeeded Apollodorus.

von Arnim<sup>4</sup> has collected eleven other passages in which this philosopher is mentioned; in nine of these he is called simply by his name; in two passages of Cicero (*de div.* I. 13; II. 47) the epithet *Stoicus* is added; nowhere is he called *Sidonius*.

However, though the evidence either of the *Index Herculaneum* or of the questionable Philo would be weak in itself, the apparent agreement of the two is strong testimony in favour of the reading Σιδώνιος or Σιδόνιος being correct in both, and Comparetti concludes reasonably that 'Sidon had two Boethi, one a Stoic, the other a Peripatetic, just as it had two Zenos, a Stoic and an Epicurean.'

The heresies of the Stoic Boethus may be summarized from von Arnim's extracts, as follows: he admitted four *criteria*—Mind, Sensation, Appetency, and Knowledge; he stated that the essence of God is the sphere of the fixed stars; he denied that the Universe was a living creature; he denied the *ēkpiρωσις*.

There remains only the question of the time when Boethus the Stoic lived. The approximate date of the Peripatetic is fixed by Strabo, who mentions among distinguished Sidonians of his own time Βόηθος τε φ

<sup>1</sup> Diels, *Doxogr. Gr.*, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> Maass attributes it to Sporos of Nicaea, first to second century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Comparetti, *Papiro inedito circulanense*, in

*Rivista di Filologia* (Turin) III. 523 (1875).

<sup>4</sup> *Stoic. Vet. Fr.* III. 265.

*συνεφιλοσοφήσαμεν τὰ Ἀριστοτέλεια καὶ Διόδοτος ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ* (Strabo xvi. p. 757).<sup>1</sup>

A passage from Diogenes has been cited to prove that the Stoic was a contemporary of Chrysippus, viz. Diog. Laert. vii. 54. ὁ μὲν γὰρ Βόηθος κριτήρια πλείουν ἀπολείπει, νοῦν καὶ αἰσθησιν καὶ ὄρεξιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην· ὁ δὲ Χρύσιππος διαφέρομενος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ λόγου κριτήρια φησιν εἶναι αἰσθησιν καὶ πρόληψιν. Comparetti, taking these words to imply that Boethus and Chrysippus were contemporary, or Boethus the earlier of the two, decides that the passage is either corrupt or refers to an earlier Stoic also named Boethus, for a contemporary of Chrysippus could not be the successor of Apollodorus mentioned in his papyrus. It is unnecessary, however, to admit this third man, though Luthe as late as 1890 asserted a belief in him (*die Erkenntnisstheorie der Stoiker*, p. 22). Bake, a century ago, suggested that Diogenes did not mean to suggest, by διαφέρομενος, a dispute between two contemporaries; he was not thinking of chronology, but, as it were, arranging parallel extracts, with the comment 'Here Chrysippus does not agree with Boethus.' Susemihl (*Rhein. Mus.*, 1891) recognizes the tenability of Bake's theory, but thinks the translation forced, and supports the reading αὐτὸν, which he justifies by showing that Chrysippus has, in the twelfth book of his *Physics*, quoted by Diogenes just before the present passage, made καταληπτικὴ φαντασία the criterion, and now in the first book περὶ λόγου sets up other criteria. We may remember that such ἐναντιολογία—self-contradiction—of Chrysippus is much insisted on by Galen.

Boethus the Stoic, therefore, may keep his place after Apollodorus, a successor of Panaetius.

J. F. DOBSON.

THE UNIVERSITY, BRISTOL,  
October, 1913.

<sup>1</sup> His views were unorthodox on some points (Ammonius in Arist. *An. Pr.* 1. 45). There was also an Academic Boethus (*Ind. Herc.* col. 28), but he considerably selected a different birth-

place, as far as we know. Boethus, a compiler of Platonic *λέξεις*, is mentioned by the Patriarch Photius (*Bibl.* 154, 155).

<sup>1</sup> *Synon*  
'Der Un  
viel näher  
hat, näm  
über . .  
Anordnu

## XPH AND ΔEI.

### I.

The words *χρῆ* and *δεῖ*, with their inflectional and dialectic variations, are less definite and stable in their semantic range than the other Greek expressions for the general ideas of necessity, obligation, or propriety. Their semantic boundaries varied with the dialect, province of literature, and period—which cannot, indeed, be entirely separated. From Homer to Aristotle there is a steady trend, so plain that the slight notice taken of it is rather surprising. Everyone sees that the two are sometimes differentiated; yet it seems to be loosely taken for granted that they are substantially equivalent, and that either may, almost anywhere, be taken as an equivalent of the verbal in *-τέος*. The statements in Liddell and Scott under *χρῆ* present an admirable confusion of all periods and styles, and J. H. H. Schmidt,<sup>1</sup> with no mention of dates, makes a distinction that resembles a reversal of the true relation. But in fact we have here an interesting example of historical development of two synonyms, never identical, one gradually crowding the other out—the sort of thing that goes on in every language from beginning to end of its life. The course of that development is what this paper will endeavour to set forth.

The briefest comparison of *falloir* and *devoir*, *müssen* and *sollen*, and our *must*, *shall*, *should*, and *ought* will show how subtly even languages closely akin differ in the lines of distinction they draw in the use of these common words, and how, within the same language, usage changes with time, in ways difficult even for the native to follow in retrospect.<sup>2</sup> A few reminders of present English usage will help to clear our ground a little.

That *must* is in general distinct from *ought* and *should* is obvious. It asserts a necessity, implies that the matter cannot be otherwise, the source and degree of compulsion varying widely with the situation. On the other hand, *ought* and *should* indicate obligation of a moral nature, resting on the sense of fitness, expediency, propriety, or duty. These last terms themselves imply a wide range; and the sense of such obligation may also become a necessity, expressed by *must*, for one who feels it. Here is a place where the two groups

<sup>1</sup> *Synonymik der gr. Sprache*, III. p. 704 sq.  
'Der Unterschied liegt jedoch so, dass *δεῖ* eine viel nähere Beziehung auf wirkliche Pflichten hat, namentlich auf solche der Gottheit gegenüber . . . dass *δεῖ* bezeichne das der höheren Anordnung entsprechende, während *χρῆ* mehr

das der Zeit und den Umständen entsprechende bedeutet.'

<sup>2</sup> A recent study of this kind is 'Shall and Will—an Historical Study,' by Professor C. B. Bradley, in *Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc.* XLII. (1911), pp. 5–31.

overlap. *Should* and *ought* are similar in origin, both being petrified imperfects of verbs meaning *owe*. But *shall* ceased long ago to mean *owe*, in popular consciousness. We commonly think of it as an auxiliary used to form a future with a modal colour, and even this faint remnant of the original force of *shall* is in some danger of being lost. Yet in a few phrases more of that original meaning survives, as in the imperative future, 'Thou shalt not.' German *sollen* retains more of this earlier force. *Should*, now a present, remains in circulation (in a principal clause, when not a mere auxiliary) for a modified form of the notion of owing. But *owe* is in daily use, and the imperfect *ought*, likewise become a present, has not lost all its earlier force, even though another imperfect *owed* has been formed, and speakers are hardly conscious of the connexion between *ought* and *owe*. Thus one may explain the fact that *ought* is ordinarily stronger than *should*, and is more likely to be employed when distinctly moral obligation is to be emphasized.

A few examples will illustrate transitions. 'It must be so; Plato, thou reasonest well.' Here the compulsion is the speaker's feeling that the reasoning is cogent—a common type, the inferential *must*, Plato's *ἀνάγκη*, *ἀναγκαῖον*. If one says to a child, 'You must not do that,' *must* is the requirement of authority, which has many shades and degrees. 'It must never be forgotten that he was a pagan.' This will serve as an example of what we may call conditional necessity, which also takes many forms. If some end is to be attained (here perhaps justice in estimating a character), something is declared to be a necessary prerequisite. Not far removed is the *must* of moral obligation, as 'I must work the works of him that sent me.' 'A judge must not take bribes.' Without context one cannot be certain whether this *must* is the moral, the authoritative, or the logical; whether it means that an upright judge's self-respect forbids taking a bribe, or that the law forbids it, or that the one who accepts a bribe is thereby no judge, but an interested party. All three would be expressed in Attic by a verbal in *-τέος*, by *δεῖ*, or by *ἀνάγκη*, according to the degree of emphasis intended; position and particles may give additional colour.

When the subject of *ought* is a person, the appeal to the moral sense, or the reason and sense of propriety of a free moral being, is usually clear. In such a sentence as 'These things ought not so to be,' or 'This ought to be done at once,' a moral obligation is stated, but the person subject to the obligation is left to be inferred. One can hardly read a statement of moral obligation into a sentence like 'He ought to have been born rich'—hardly even a reference to reason or the sense of propriety, but only to the sense of appropriateness or fitness. What is meant is that so-and-so's tastes and inclinations do not befit poverty; that in some sense the possession of wealth would better accord with such a character. We have here in fact a colloquial extension, a considerable attenuation, of *ought*, which is however quite natural. Again, the French say, 'Le train doit partir à telle heure,' and we cannot, in the same sense, say, 'The train ought to start at 3.20.' But we do say, 'The train is due,' or 'ought to be here'; if it is late in starting we may

say, 'The train ought to have started ten minutes ago,' or 'We ought to be moving.' These all involve the same thought. The printed time-table is taken as establishing an order; the operators of the railway have morally bound themselves to conform *κατὰ δύναμιν* to the order they have established. In Greek thought the conception of divine, or at least superhuman, apportionment, *μοῖρα*, establishing an order of a religious or moral nature, gave rise to similar expressions. In Biblical English, 'Ought not Christ [R.V. behoved it not] to have suffered these things,' is of similar character; the Scriptures had predicted, the disciples should therefore have expected, what had occurred. *ἔδει* is the original here; an Attic writer before Aristotle would probably have used *χρῆν*.

The foregoing review of our usage is very summary, but will serve to show how closely related, and yet distinct, the synonyms are, and that we must constantly look to context and the situation in order to detect the nature of the obligation intended. We must expect a similar play of relations and distinctions in Greek; and we should take it for granted that Greek readers felt discriminations, as we do in English, at least of colour and atmosphere, even in the few cases where one of the pair might have been substituted for the other without impropriety.

Verbals in -*réos* are not Homeric; but after they appear we find them used in all the senses just pointed out for *must*, *ought*, and *should*, when no emphasis is laid on the nature of the requirement. *χρή* and *δεῖ*, on the other hand, discriminate; vaguely at first, then with increasing clearness, then with gradual contraction of *χρή*, until it almost disappears, leaving *δεῖ*, without discrimination, in possession of the field. That, in outline, is the course of development which we are to trace.

## II.

In Homer *δεῖ* occurs in this form once only, I 337 *τί δὲ δεῖ πολεμιζέμεναι Τρώεσσιν | Ἀργείους*; Ebeling translates *opus est*. In Σ 100 *ἐμένο δ' ἔδησεν ἀρής ἀλκηῆρα γενέσθαι, ἔδησε* has the meaning and construction of Attic *ἔδέησε had need of, caruit*. This is all we see of *δεῖ* in Homer. It states a need, a lack, of something thought desirable. This earliest quotable meaning is the starting-point of all extensions and developments, and never ceases to be frequent. An Athenian of Plato's time, if he thought about it at all, must have been conscious of this as the primary sense of the word. On the other hand *χρή*, with its variations *χρεά*, *χρειά*, not only has in Homer this meaning *opus est*, but covers the whole field of *must*, *ought*, *should*, *is necessary*, *it behoves*, *is fitting*, *is the divine will*. *προσήκει* does not occur, nor *πρέπει* in the sense *is fitting*. As an example of *χρειά* we may take the familiar passage A 341 *εἰ ποτε δὴ αὐτεὶ χρειῶ ἐμένο γένεται ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι*. *χρή* in the same sense is illustrated in a 124 *ὅτεο σε χρή*. For the rest it will suffice to quote the meanings enumerated in Seiler-Capelle: '*es ist nötig, nötigt, es braucht, soll, muss, man muss,*

*es ist billig, es ziemt, es frommt.*' The imperfect (*ē*)*χρῆν* is later. That something ought to be which is not, or ought to have been which was not, is expressed by the imperfect (or aorist) of ὁφεῖλω (ὁφέλλω) *owe*, with an infinitive. Examples are A 353 τιμήν πέρ μοι ὁφελλεν Ὀλύμπιος ἐγγυαλίξαι. K 117 sq. νῦν ὁφελεν κατὰ πάντας ἀριστής πονέεσθαι | λισσόμενος· χρείω γὰρ ικάνεται οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτός.

Obscure as the etymological relations of *χρή* are, it would seem that there must have been a connexion with *χρέος* *need* and *debt*, with *χράω* (*χρέω*, *χρείω*), *give oracular response* (*Odyssey* and *Hymns*), mid. *inquire of an oracle* (as in θ 79-82), and later *χρησμός*, as well as with *χρίουμαι* *use*, and *χρῆμα* *useful thing*. There is no difficulty in supposing a natural connexion, in earlier thought, between all these forms of human interest; but such hypotheses have little bearing on our purpose, except in one particular. In post-Homeric development the aspect of *χρή* which persisted, which *χρή* retained as long as it retained anything, was that which would most easily connect it with the oracle, as the expression of settled religious and moral order and the divine will.

In Pindar also δεῖ occurs but once, *Ol.* vi. 28 πρὸς Πιτάναν δὲ παρ' Εύρώτα πόρον δεῖ σάμερον ἐλθεῖν. *Must* is our natural word. To indicate the subject of his song the poet adopts the figure of having a journey to make. The suggestion of moral obligation has no place in the word till far later. For *χρή* Rumpel gives the translations *opus est*, *oportet*, *decet*, with twenty-six references, now slightly increased by the new fragments. The range of meaning is nearly as wide as in Homer, but no genitive occurs with it. P. iv. 1 σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ' ἄνδρὶ φίλῳ | στᾶμεν is like the passage just quoted for δεῖ. In some cases it is quite impossible to say whether *it behoves*, *is fitting*, *ought*, *should*, or *must* is the more appropriate; *χρή* and the context admit any one of them. Poetic breadth, inclusive generalization rather than precise detail, is Pindar's manner. In P. ii. 88 χρή δὲ πρὸς θεὸν οὐκ ἐρίζειν the idea of religious or moral obligation lies nearest, as also in N. xi. 47 κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν, and in P. iii. 59 and a few other passages. Is. iii. 7 εὐκλέων δ' ἔργων ἀποινα χρὴ μὲν ὑμηῆσαι τὸν ἐσλόν is the type of several—'we should praise the good; it is right to give honour due,' and so on. πρέπον ἦν is the scholiast's paraphrase for ἐχρῆν N. vii. 44. In the sense of *service due*, *debt*, *χρέος* occurs several times, also *χρεών* (sc. ἔστι) *oportet*. *χρῆν* in the fragment of an enkomion for Theoxenos (123, 1), χρῆν μὲν κατὰ καιρὸν ἐρώτων δρέπεσθαι, θῦμε, σὺν ἀλικίᾳ, is *oportebat quidem* (but it is now too late). Also in the new Paian vi. 96 περὶ δ' ὑψικόμῳ Ἐλένῃ χρῆν ἄρα Πέργαμον εὑρὼν ἀιστῶσαι σέλας αἰθόμενον πυρός we meet *χρῆν* with the force of *it was fated*. While the range is wide, the tone of *oportet*, *decet* is beginning to prevail.

Bacchylides, with no instance of δεῖ and six of *χρή*, agrees with Pindar. For one *χρή* the sentence is mutilated; one is the *must* of Apollo's declaration of fate to Admetos (iii. 78), three are of the duty or propriety of praising desert, one (v. 164) of the propriety, since laments avail not, of confining speech to

what is within one's power.  $\chiρεῖ[ος]$  μάχας need of battle occurs once, and  $\chiρέος$  once is thing.

In Aischylos the situation is changed a little. δεῖ appears twenty-four or twenty-five times, and the only definition in Dindorf's lexicon is *opus est*. In eleven of these passages the genitive is present. In the remaining passages the infinitive is expressed or understood, and in all the thought is *there is need or occasion*. There is still no suggestion of an appeal to the moral or religious sense. The imperfect does not occur, nor δέη (subjv.), δέοι, δεήσει, for which Pindar also found no occasion. On the other hand, χρή with inflectional variations occurs about sixty times, and a restriction of its range on that side which δεῖ occupies is becoming clearer. Dindorf's translations are *oportet* and *debere*. There are five instances of χρῆν, all in *Ag.* and *Ch.*, all without ἀν, and all with the clear sense of *oportebat*—as *Ch.* 907 ἐπεὶ φιλεῖς τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, δὲ χρῆν φιλεῖν στυγεῖς. Several examples of χρή, it is true, would admit δεῖ as well, with a slightly different turn. One is *Suppl.* 938 τί σοι λέγειν χρὴ τοῦνομα; in more than half, however, the meaning falls within the range of *it behoves, is fitting, seemly*, approaching on the one side the notion of moral obligation, on the other that of *it is better, there is good reason*. Among the remainder, in eight or nine cases a person in authority, or one giving directions or advice, uses χρή where German would use *sollen*, of future action of the person addressed; and Dindorf gives three examples, to which three or four may be added, where χρή (one χρείν of indirect quotation) signifies *is destined*. χρεών occurs six times. In *Ch.* 930 τὸ μὴ χρεῶν πάθει it is *id quod oportet*; in *Pr.* 996 *is destined*.

In Sophokles the matter has become more complicated. The number of occurrences of both words, in a somewhat larger number of lines, is more than twice that in the elder dramatist. The ratio of occurrences of δεῖ to those of χρή, in their various forms, is about the same, something like 1 : 2. But δεῖ has encroached farther on the original sphere of χρή. ἔδει, δεῖν, and δέον make their appearance, and the tendency to specialization of χρή is increasing. Ellendt-Genthe and Dindorf in their lexicons translate δεῖ by both *opus est* and *oportet*. In more than four-fifths of the passages containing the form δεῖ, and in the single passage containing δεῖν, the meaning is clearly within the range of *opus est, must, circumstances make it needful*. In eight cases the genitive is present; elsewhere the infinitive is expressed or understood. But in a few cases δεῖ may be brought within the range of *should* or *ought*. An example is *Phil.* 583 λέγονθ' ἀ μὴ δεῖ. (Cp. Aisch. *Ag.* 342 πορθεῖν ἀ μὴ χρή). Among the seven instances of ἔδει are two or three more of this kind. One is *Phil.* 418 τούσδε γὰρ μὴ ζῆν ἔδει, another is *O.T.* 1185 οὐς τέ μ' οὐκ ἔδει κτανών. In one instance, *O.T.* 825 γάμοις με δεῖ μητρὸς ζυγῆναι, δεῖ is the *must* of destiny and oracular prediction—a meaning which Dindorf notes as Herodotean, and which we found to belong to χρή in Homer, Pindar, and Aischylos, as it does elsewhere in Sophokles. The neuter participle occurs twice in the phrase ἐσ δέον, and once in the phrase πρὸ τοῦ δέοντος, both easily

connected with the primary sense of *δεῖ*, but taking on that of fitness or propriety.

*χρεών* occurs eighteen times, always as a neuter substantive, having the same range of meaning as *χρή*, for which it seems to be mainly a metrically convenient substitute. *χρέος* occurs four times, denoting *thing*, *debt* or *fault*, *duty*. The imperfect (*ἐ*)*χρῆν* is used of destiny a few times, of unfulfilled duty (without *ἄν*) about as often—of something which ought to be but is not, or ought to have been but was not. The remaining occurrences of *χρή*, *χρῆναι*, *χρεῖη*, some eighty in number, are distributed as to meaning very much as in Aischylos, the great majority clearly within the range of *it behoves*, *is fitting* or *seemly*, *one ought*. As before remarked, German *sollen* is sometimes more exact than either English word. The range in *O.T.*, or almost any play, gives a fair notion of the range in all.

For Euripides my full notes cover but five plays (*Alkestis*, *Medea*, *Hippolytos*, *Iphigeneia T.*, *Bacchae*), enough to show that his usage is not notably different from that of Sophokles. He is fonder of *χρεών* as parallel to *χρή*, and *τοῦ χρεών* appears in *Hip.* 1256 beside *μοίρας* in the same line, where it is difficult to see any distinction. (*ἐ*)*χρῆν* is nearly always *oportebat*; in ἀ μή σε *δεῖ* (*Alk.* 63) *δεῖ* is *oportet*. In all tragedy it should be noted that both *δεῖ* and *χρή* seldom appear in the lyric.

Aristophanes I pass over, because the peculiar shifts of tone, the mixture of common speech, of joke, and of solemn parody, render him less instructive for our purpose—or, at least, greatly increase the difficulty of drawing the right conclusions.

### III.

The collections in Diels' *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* yield a few interesting facts. In Anaximander's *κατὰ τὸ χρεών*, as Mr. Cornford says,<sup>1</sup> 'are united the conceptions of Fate and Right; it means a power that ordains both what *must* be and what *ought* to be.' This conception is fundamental to our whole discussion. That Herakleitos, in our scanty fragments, has *χρή* five times and *δεῖ* once, and that Parmenides likewise has *χρή*, *χρέω*, *χρῆν*, *χρέος*, *χρεών* (twice), *χρεόν* (and no *δεῖ*), well scattered over the Homeric range, was to be expected. That the more extensive remnants of Empedokles have *δεῖ* once only, and *χρή* not at all may be accidental; but Philolaos and Archytas, in prose, each repeat Empedokles in that regard. The scanty remnants of Anaxagoras, on the other hand, furnish *χρὴ δοκεῖν* and *γυγνώσκειν χρή*. *Must* seems to be demanded, but he may have chosen the less positive form of statement. Finally, nearly 300 fragments given by Diels for Demokritos, largely short sentences of the nature of moral precepts, furnish nine cases of *δεῖ* (including one *δέη* and one *ἐς δέον*) and eleven of *χρή*, with seven of *χρεών* and one of *χρῆναι*—about 1 : 2, as in tragedy. And the differentiation is com-

<sup>1</sup> From *Religion to Philosophy*, p. 11.

plete. *τὰ χρὴ ἔοντα* (256) are *duties*; *Pflichten* is Diels' word. *δεῖ* is always *must*, *there is need or occasion*; *χρή* etc. always express obligation of a moral sort. Here, in one Ionic prose writer, limited by accident in a peculiar way, yet not so scanty but that the evidence may be significant, the rule is unbroken which Attic prose before Aristotle closely approaches.

For Herodotus my notes cover the first three books and the last three; the full evidence from the rest could hardly alter conclusions very much. First to be noted is the gain of *δεῖ* over *χρῆ*. Including all the modes, and *χρέον* as an equivalent of *χρῆ*, but not including the participle *δέων* either in the sense of *lacking*, with a genitive, or in the phrases *ἐς δέον*, *ἐν δέοντι*, the two words are about equally frequent, fifty to sixty each in the six books, *δεῖ* having a slight preponderance. The differentiation is clear, but not complete, notably less complete in the first book than in all the later books. *χράω* is also fairly frequent (*χρᾶ*, *χρέωσα*, *χρήσειν*, *ἔχρησε*, *χρῆσον*, *χρήσαντος*, *ἔκέχρηστο*); also *χρέος* *debt*.

In i. 8 and 120 *χρῆν* is *it was fated*; the usual Herodotean word in the other books is *δεῖ* (as *ἔδει* ii. 161, viii. 53; *δέοι* ii. 139; *δεῖν* viii. 62), occasionally *χρέον* (as viii. 141, ix. 42). *χρῆν* in i. 186 means *was necessary* (to cross with boats), in i. 196 *was required* (to furnish sureties), which are ordinarily expressed in Herodotus as in Attic prose by *ἔδει*, though in viii. 129 we again find *χρῆν* in the same sense. Occasionally both appear side by side, with no mark of difference. In i. 57 *εἰ δὲ χρέον ἐστι τεκμαιρόμενον λέγειν* is repeated at the end of the same long sentence by *εἰ τούτοισι τεκμαιρόμενον δεῖ λέγειν*. The thought is, *if it is proper to infer* (from existing Pelasgians). In vii. 11 we have *εἰ χρὴ σταθμώσασθαι* in this sense, and in vii. 214 *τοῦτο γὰρ τῷδε χρὴ σταθμώσασθαι*, as in Soph. *O.T.* 1110 *εἰ χρή τι κάμε . . . σταθμᾶσθαι*. In i. 11 *ὡς ἀν μὴ . . . ἵδης τὰ μὴ σε δεῖ* we have a parallel to *ἀ μὴ σε δεῖ* of Euripides, cited above; *χρῆ* was the more usual word in Herodotus as in all Attic authors. In ii. 133 *οὐ γὰρ ποιῆσαι νν τὸ χρεὸν ἦν ποιεῖν· δεῖν γὰρ Λίγυπτον κακοῦσθαι ἐπ' ἔτεα πεντήκοντα καὶ ἑκατόν κ.τ.λ.* one can hardly demonstrate a distinction. But the usual distinction, with *δεῖν* in the place of emphasis, gives just the meaning needed to save the credit of the oracle. 'He had not done what he ought to have done; Egypt *needed* a hundred and fifty years of suffering, and his predecessors had understood this and done their part; he had failed the divine powers and deserved his fate.' We cannot make this *δεῖν* signify the *must* of oracular prediction; that he could not have frustrated.

But in spite of a few cases where distinctions are not clear, even in the first book *δεῖ* generally signifies *there is lack*, or *need*, *one must*, while *χρῆ* is more often *oporet*. In ii., iii., vii.-ix. exceptions to the rule are in any case few. If we allow the legitimate presumption that a distinction, certainly usual, was probably intended in most cases of doubt, exceptions are very few—none, I think, in iii., vii.-ix. beyond those cited above. In ix. 65 *δοκέω δέ, εἴ τι περὶ τῶν θείων πρηγμάτων δοκέειν δεῖ, ή θεὸς αὐτῇ σφεας οὐκ ἐδέκετο* the context, and his feeling on such subjects, as explained in ii. 65, quite explain this mild *must*.

at the end of the clause, where it escapes all stress. In i. 42 ἐπει τε σὺ σπεύδεις καὶ δεῖ τοι χαρίζεσθαι (όφειλω γάρ σε ἀμείβεσθαι χρηστοῖσι) the *must* is explained by ὄφειλω . . . χρηστοῖσι. (In vii. 16γ ὄφειλω recurs: ‘the dream ought to appear to me as well as to you;’ and in vii. 152 ‘I am bound (ὄφειλω) to tell what is told, but am not bound to believe it.’) In i. 69 ἐντειλάμενος τὰ λέγειν χρῆν was *sie sagen sollten* is of a familiar type. The obligation is that imposed by one who is in a position to give advice or commands—an obligation close to the *must* of authority, but less imperative in tone. Correspondingly χρή in independent clauses may in some situations mean no more than *it is better, one may fairly*, where *ought* would be too strong, and *should* may not be idiomatic, but *oportet* or *debet* would seem in place. In i. 108 ὁ βασιλεὺν . . . εἴ τοι φίλον τοῦτο οὐτώ γίγνεσθαι, χρὴ δὴ τό γε ἐμὸν ὑπηρετέεσθαι ἐπιτηδείως, if we interpret χρή in the light of general Herodotean usage, *it is of course my duty*, we have the proper deferential tone, more suitable than that of *must*, which this context, taken alone, would equally permit. Finally we may note again that we have hitherto found no ἔδει or (ἐ)χρῆν accompanied by ἄν.

For the difference between the first and the other books the readiest explanation is the difference in sources. For parts of the first these were earlier epics, under the influence of Homer’s vocabulary, and earlier logographers. Sources of a date nearer his own time, with his own or other contemporary recasting of Egyptian accounts, would reflect the extension of δεῖ and the tendency to complete the differentiation. And we see that, apart from the distinction which is well established in Demokritos, χρή, by its history, carries with it associations of antiquity, of poetry, of higher moral tone. In contrast, δεῖ is more a prose word, associated with the logical, the commonplace, the non-emotional world; χρή has about it something of the elevated, the religious atmosphere. The associated infinitive, or the rest of the sentence, often harmonizes noticeably with such an atmosphere.

In Thukydides the numerical relation between δεῖ and χρή is about the same as in Herodotus. δεῖ has enlarged its inflection a little, though the present and imperfect indicative outnumber all other forms together. The relative increase of speeches, argument, reflection, increases the frequency of both words. The genitive occurs often with δεῖ, and χρή has now quite given over the meaning *there is lack, need*; *opus est* is so prevailing and unmistakeable for δεῖ that not many cases call for discussion.

No less than twenty-two of the thirty-four instances of ἔδει are of the type seen in iv. 77, Ι ἡμέρα δ' αὐτοῖς εἴρητο γέ ἔδει ἀμα ταῦτα πράσσειν, where ἔδει denotes that the action was agreed upon, or was the effect of authoritative arrangement. This approaches the Herodotean type noted above (as τὰ λέγειν χρῆν, i. 69), but it is not quite the same. For where Thukydides wishes to express the more personal relation he also can use χρῆν, as in iv. 90, 4 Ἰπποκράτης δὲ ὑπομένων ἔτι καθίστατο φυλακάς τε καὶ τὰ περὶ τὸ προτείχισμα, ὅσα ἦν ὑπόλοιπα, ὡς χρῆν ἐπιτελέσαι, or in vi. 57, Ι διεκόσμει ὡς ἔκαστα ἐχρῆν τῆς πομπῆς προιέναι. The difference in tone is unmistakeable; nor is it

altogether fanciful to call it characteristic that the Athenian historian uses *χρῆν* in just this way comparatively little. The unemotional *ἔδει* for such strategic combinations is more like our colourless *were to do this, had been directed, were expected*. The requirements of other than military agreements are expressed by the same *ἔδει*, as i. 96, 1 ἔταξαν ὡς τε ἔδει παρέχειν τῶν πόλεων χρήματα πρὸς τὸν βάρβαρον καὶ ὡς ναῦς, and v. 60, 1 τέσσαρας μῆνας, ἐν οἷς ἔδει ἐπιτελέσαι αὐτοὺς τὰ ρήθεντα, and v. 15, 2 ποιοῦνται ἐνιαύσιον ἐκεχειρίαν, ἐν γῇ ἔδει ξυνιόντας καὶ περὶ τοῦ πλέονος χρόνου βουλεύεσθαι, and vi. 56, 2 ἔδει ἄρξαι μὲν αὐτούς, συνεπαμύνειν δὲ ἐκείνους, and vii. 8, 3 φέροντες . . . τὰ γράμματα καὶ ὅσα ἔδει αὐτοὺς εἰπεῖν. In several of these twenty-two no doubt Herodotus would have written *χρῆν*. The only other examples of *δεῖ* that can raise any serious questions are a few of the present indicative, where the immediate context alone is not decisive. The most dubious, perhaps, is iii. 47, 5. Diodotus is pleading for Mytilene. In οὓς μὴ δεῖ διαφθεῖραι what sort of obligation is he stating? Is it the moral *ought*, which is quite applicable, or the logical *must* of an appeal to self-interest? Each reader may choose. To my mind the tone of the whole speech makes for the latter, wholly apart from the argument of overwhelming preponderance of usage, which creates a strong presumption unless a special context or some often recurring phrase points plainly the other way. As we have seen, that presumption sometimes reveals an unsuspected felicity or delicacy of expression, which is at once felt to be probable, even though not demonstrable.

Only once does *ἄν* appear with *ἔδει* (i. 74, 4) never with (*ἐ*)*χρῆν*.

About nine-tenths of the occurrences of *χρῆ* are in speeches, or in the indirect report of speeches, where the prevalent tone is that of deliberation and argument. *χρῆ* outnumbers all other forms; *χρῆναι* stands next in frequency. In four-fifths or more of the examples no one would question that the obligation is of the *oportet* class; with others a question is possible, and we should expect old usage to continue alongside the new, especially in a style so austere and consciously archaic. It is surprising rather that the differentiation is so nearly complete.

Of course the *must* of fate is never expressed by either word; Thukydides had none of the Herodotean attitude touching oracles and the like. It has already been noted that the meaning *there is lack* or *need* is resigned to *δεῖ*. Deliberation about action in the near future is the prevailing tone of the setting; serious men are taking counsel on matters of the highest concern. Obligations based on reason and good sense, on the hope of success, on religion and morality, are often to the fore; if not what we call duty, then at least the better policy, dressed out with a moral air. ‘We should spare their land, lest we make them desperate’ (i. 82, 4); ‘we should still farther endure, for it is your proud inheritance that you win your virtues from toils’ (i. 123, 1); ‘all the more should we accept allies and send aid quickly’ (iii. 13, 2); ‘you should fortify Dekeleia in Attica, the very thing the Athenians always fear most’ (vi. 91, 6)—these are typical examples of *χρῆ* taken almost at random.

*μαθεῖν* (*εἰδέναι*, *γνῶναι*) *χρή* are recurring phrases. Allied to these are the indignant questions *πῶς χρή* and *πῶς οὐ χρή* with infinitive, and the indirect quotations with *ώς χρή* (as v. 63, 2 ἐβούλευντο *ώς χρή τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ κατασκάψαι*), and the indirect questions like i. 119 *εἰ χρὴ πολεμεῖν*, or v. 62, 1 *ἐφ' ὅτι χρὴ πρῶτον ιέναι*, or vii. 67, 2 *οὐδὲ ὅπως καθεξομένους χρὴ τὸ βέλος ἀφεῖναι*, or viii. 95, 4 *σημεῖον ὅποτε χρὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἥρθη*. And these indirect questions, with the direct forms, are parallel with the dubitative subjunctive—sometimes a mere circumlocution, but with a wider range, and always explicitly stating in *χρή* what is implicit in the subjunctive. What the subjunctive in that function suggests and *χρή* expresses is precisely what we mean by *ought*, *should*, *sollen*. In other instances that appear doubtful it is sometimes clarifying to consider whether *sollen* (or *sollten*) would not be the German rendering.

In a passage like iii. 46, 6 *χρὴ δὲ τὸν ἀλευθέρους οὐκ ἀφισταμένους σφόδρα κολάζειν*, ἀλλὰ πρὸν ἀποστῆναι σφόδρα φυλάσσειν it matters little whether we render *χρή* (and *χρῆναι* in the sentence before) by *ought* or by the *must* of moral conviction. In iv. 21, 3 *ἔπεισεν ἀποκρίνασθαι ὡς χρὴ τὰ μὲν ὅπλα καὶ σφᾶς αὐτοὺς . . . παραδόντας κ.τ.λ.* we seem to have the Herodotean *χρή* of command—possibly a slight softening of the form, to a conquered enemy, in place of a harsh *δεῖ* or *ἀνάγκη*, *that they should surrender* in place of *they must*. Finally, in v. 35, 3 *χρόνους τε προβεντο ἐν οἷς χρῆν τὸν μὴ ἔσιόντας ἀμφοτέρους πολεμίους εἶναι*, the Spartans are made to put forward their requirement as something reasonable and appropriate—‘they ought to take their position in the reasonable time named, if they did not wish to be treated as enemies.’

Of the seven occurrences of *χρεῶν* only one (iii. 40, 4) calls for special notice, and that as the sole instance of an accusative absolute.

#### IV.

Among the orators the change from Antiphon to Demosthenes is wide. In the former *χρή* and its forms exceed slightly in number *δεῖ* and its forms, likewise in Lysias and Isokrates. In Aischines, if we may judge from the speech *On the Crown* alone, *δεῖ* distinctly has the upper hand. In Demosthenes *δεῖ* and its family are five times as numerous as *χρή* and its family; so in Xenophon's *Anabasis*: in the *Memorabilia* the preponderance is less, about 3 : 1. None of this group uses *χρεῶν*. Nowhere is the differentiation clearer than in the *Anabasis*, but the orators named are close beside Xenophon in this. The difference in ratios goes with a difference in subject and in tone. The most we can see by way of anticipation of the next generation is that *δεῖ* (and particularly *δέον* as accusative absolute, because of the convenience of its inflection) is taking a little more of the common territory. It is noticeable, however, that the semantic difference is especially clear when position at the beginning of a clause, or collocation of particles, makes the word in question prominent.

In Plato, from his extent and variety, the comparison is particularly interesting; but my notes, though they cover a respectable fraction, do not

cover the whole. With one exception, which others have noted, it does not seem that safe chronological inferences can be drawn, because change of tone and subject is reflected in this element of style more than is any change in habit of expression at different periods. Yet it is possible that closer observation may reveal other indications of date. The following table<sup>1</sup> will serve as a starting point.

	<i>Apol.</i>	<i>Prot.</i>	<i>Phaedo</i>	<i>Theaet.</i>	<i>Rep.</i>	<i>Laws v.-xii.</i>
δεῖ	21	25	41	30	249	285
χρή	7	14	22	18	48	180
χρεών	—	—	—	—	—	52

In the *Apology* πολλοῦ δέων and πολλοῦ δεῖ are unusually frequent and are not counted; τὸ δέον (*τοῦ δέοντος, τὰ δέοντα*) and the participle with a genitive are not included in this table, nor in the discussion of any Attic prose writers, because they do not bear so much on our problem. The slight inconsistency as compared with earlier writers, where such expressions are few, does not matter for our purpose. What strikes one at a glance is the varying ratios in different dialogues. In the *Republic* the ratio is that of the *Anabasis*; in the *Laws* not far from that of Aischines; in the *Protagoras, Phaedo, Theaetetus*, it is roughly 2 : 1. Different books of the *Republic* and *Laws* vary more than any two Attic authors. Closer scrutiny is requisite to reveal the significance of this, and we shall return to it presently.

Meantime we may note along what line δεῖ is gaining. In Thuk. ii. 89, 8 ὡς χρή is ὀρθῶς as one should; ἐν δέοντι is at the right moment, when one should. The difference between *oportet* and *opus est* is here, but the close kinship is obvious. The needful moment is when one ought to act. Again, compare Thuk. iv. 63, 2 φίλοι μὲν τοῦ ἔχθιστοις διάφοροι δὲ οἱς οὐ χρή with Soph. O.T. 1185 sq. πέφασμα φύς τ' ἄφ' ὧν οὐ χρῆν, ξὺν οἷς τ' | οὐ χρῆν ὄμιλῶν, οὓς τέ μ' οὐκ ἔδει κτανόν. Such collocations illustrate how nearly allied are the notions of 'need,' 'requirement,' 'right,' 'duty.' There is an overlapping, a common field, which one may come at from either side. When δεῖ is becoming the readier word in daily speech, one naturally chooses it often for that common region. So οἷον χρή (as in Dem. xx. 107) readily passes into οἷον δεῖ, while οἷον χρή may recur at any moment. For οὐ γάρ νόθους ἔδει ἀπτεσθαι ἀλλὰ γηγενίους (*Rep.* 535c) it was needed that not bastards but true-born sons should lay hold of her is rough English for Jowett's 'her true sons should take her by the hand and not bastards.' Dem. xxiv. 127 οὐ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ἔδει δεδέσθαι; may be strictly rendered, was there not so much the more need for his being imprisoned? But more naturally, ought he not so much the more, etc. The growth of δέον as accusative absolute has been already mentioned. It is easy to see, then, how δεῖ tended to occupy the ordinary field of χρή, which became more distinctly the mark of a certain elevation of style. χρεών, in prose after Thukydides, may be called a bit of conscious ὅγκος. The orators named above

<sup>1</sup> Although due care has been taken, the accuracy of my count is not guaranteed, nor is any stress laid on slight differences. The figures should be treated as approximate.

did not use it; Plato used it only in his later period, and then but seven times outside of the *Laws*.

The variations in relative frequency are easily explained. *Laws* vi. has forty-two cases of δεῖ, forty of χρή, ten of χρεών; x. has 16, 6, 3. But the last-named is mainly the argument for the existence of gods, while the others are more continuous discourse on the principles to be observed in appointing magistrates and regulating official conduct, education, marriage, with much talk of duties and obligations in the most serious tone. In the *Republic* we have lively conversation, earnest argument, metaphysics; the ratio of χρή to δεῖ varies from 1 : 10 of books iii., vi., vii. to 10 : 16 of book i., which has most of the tone of ordinary polite conversation. The familiar *Apology*, while much too short to prove anything by itself, illustrates Plato's variety very well. With twenty-one instances of δεῖ (and the omissions noted) there are six verbals in -τέον, colourless equivalents of both δεῖ and χρή, all before 23. There are seven occurrences of χρή, six of them after 32D, with the rise to a higher spiritual plane. Meantime we find ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιμελοῦνται ὡν δεῖ (41E), because they are not attending to what they ought, and ἔδει (39B), it was inevitable, in something like the Herodotean sense, of mysterious divine ordinance, while ἀνάγκη (18D, 27C), ἀναγκαῖον (32A), δίκαιος εἰμι (18A), and ἄξιον (41D) suggest the other resources of the language.

## V.

In Aristotle δεῖ may replace χρή anywhere. All that is left for the latter is a certain bookish air, which prevents its total loss; it retains this ghostly life in prose as long as the Atticists endeavour to maintain the ancient tongue, and it remains always possible in verse. At least eight examples of χρή occur in the *Ethics*, against hundreds of δεῖ. Occasionally the two are put side by side, as 1144a 17 πράττουσί γε ἂ δεῖ καὶ ὅσα χρή τὸν σπουδαῖον, and 1169b 1 sq., οὕτω μὲν οὖν φίλαυτον εἶναι δεῖ, καθάπερ εἴρηται· ὡς δὲ οἱ πολλοί, οὐ χρή. Probably χρή has a shade more dignity, but nothing more. Even χρεών appears, as 1178b 10 (he is speaking of the gods) πράξεις δὲ ποιας ἀπονείμαι χρεῶν αὐτοῖς. Here we may see some appropriateness; but hardly in the four other passages in the *Ethics*. It suits Aristotle's general tone that prosaic δεῖ meets all needs, and large use is made of the still drier verbal.

The circle of development is complete. From the Homeric breadth and simplicity of χρή, through the poetic wealth of the fifth century and the fulness and precision of the earlier half of the fourth, we have reached the comparative poverty of the Hellenistic period, which nevertheless knows, and can use if it will, the resources of the preceding age.

THOMAS D. GOODELL.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

times

ri. has  
ut the  
others  
ointing  
much  
lic we  
χρή to  
s most  
much  
y well.  
re six  
ore 23.  
e to a  
(4IE),  
vitable,  
while  
uggest

the latter  
ghostly  
ongue,  
occur  
ide by  
b i sq.,  
χρη̄.  
χρεών  
ονεῖμαι  
the four  
saic δεῖ

th and  
fulness  
arative  
se if it

ELL.

## A NEGLECTED MANUSCRIPT OF THE *MORETVM*.

NEITHER Prof. Ellis in his *Appendix Vergiliana* (Oxonii, 1907) nor Prof. Vollmer in his edition of the same (Lipsiae, 1910), though the latter gives a long list of MSS, makes any mention of a Luxemburg MS containing the *Moretum*. The MS is numbered 27 (M. 9. 16), is of the twelfth century, and was formerly in the library of a monastery at Orval (Aurea Vallis). The Luxemburg collection is not as well known as it ought to be. A catalogue of the MSS was published in 1894 by the then custodian N. van Werveke, but the small number of copies issued does not seem to have fallen into the hands of those most interested. I have to thank the present librarian, Dr. d'Huart, for his kindness to me on the occasion of my recent visit to the library.

MS 27 is a collection of various writings diverse in age and character, which need not be enumerated. The *Moretum* occurs on folio 157 (double columns). The collation which follows was made with the edition of Ellis, takes account of *minutiae*, and was carefully revised. I leave it to those who have more leisure and more intimate acquaintance with the *Virgilian Appendix* to assign a value to the MS.

### Title VIRGILII MARONIS MVRETVM INCIPIT

3 Similus || eximii || cultor cum] cultorē (corr.) || between lines 2 and 3 in  
mg. pro 6 inerter 7 locum Iesus 8 exuto 9 celabat 10 admonet (corr. m 2) ||  
submissa || produxit (corr.) || stupas || humorē (-eras.) || carentes || 13 tanto  
(corr.) || sed lux 15 clause que peruidet hostia clavis 16 fusus (sus m 2 in ras.)  
17 petebat 18 excreuit (ex excreuerit) || podere (corr. fort. m 2) 19 Intus ||  
adsistit (ad exp. m 2) 20 fixe 21 gemina tunc 23 et 24 transpositi 23 peruerit  
|| geminumque molarum 24 partitur utramque 25 Leua 26 giris 27 tonsa ||  
ceres (c uid. in ras.) (?) 28 leua 30 suum (su s. ras.) 31 clamatur || s. scybalen  
m 2 add. pro 34 pectora || cōpressior || alno 35 spacioa 36 om. 37 nocat (?) ||  
iponere || ligna (na m 2 in ras.) 38 liores (corr. [m 2 ?]) 39 Impleuit postquam  
|| opus om. 40 crebra (corr. m 2) 42 succedit 43 emendata 44 cōponit || super  
ingerit] suffundit et 49 ipressis 51 que om. (add. m 2 [?]) || ignes 53 Similus  
55 cōparat ęscas 59 aneti 60 aeris 62 arundo 64 deerat 66 nec sumptus erat  
ullus opus sed regula curae 67 casule || pluuięque (corr. pluuięque) 70 cōmittere  
71 apte cura || submittere 72 olus || lacte || fudentes (corr. [m 2 ?]) || brachia  
bęte 73 muleque 74 capit nomen 75 om. 77 Que crescit in acumine radix  
78 granis 80 uotisque 81 ueiales humeris fasces 82 Ille 83 unquam 84 cepa

85 uultū nasturcia 86 Intubaque || eruga (*corr.*) 89 quatuor || spicis (*corr.*) ||  
 allia 90 graciles 95 cortis (*corr.* cartis) 96 adicit (*ex adducit?*) 97 tinguit  
 || lapidesque 98 adheso 99 inserit 100 leuo || setosa || inguine 101 flagrantia  
 102 allia 103 girum || uires 104 disperdunt 105 frustra (*alt r exp.*) 107 nares  
 (*corr. nates*) 108 dāpnat || praemia 109 sepe || tergit 110 Inmeritoque || dicit  
 (*ex dicit?*) 112 lentus || orbes 114 uires || acceti 115 cōmiseret (s m 2 ex x)  
 118 que fort. m 2 119 scibale (pro s.l.) 120 recius uel rectus (c s.l.) 121 Iam  
 famis] Infert || simulus 123 parentes

*Subscription P.V.M. muretum FINIT.*

A. SOUTER.

THE UNIVERSITY, ABERDEEN.

IN  
book o  
216-22.  
The fo  
present  
V

### NOTE ON THUCYDIDES VII. 28. 3.

ὅσον κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ πολέμου οἱ μὲν ἐνιαυτόν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τριῶν γε ἐτῶν  
 οὐδεὶς πλείω χρόνον ἐνόμιζον περιοίσειν αὐτοὺς, εἰ οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐσβάλοιεν ἐς  
 τὴν χώραν.

So the MSS: but difficulties are rightly felt (see Hude). If the MSS reading is retained, editors require us (i.) to place *οὐδεὶς* in partitive or limitative apposition to *οἱ δέ*; but it is not in partitive apposition, but in direct opposition and contradiction. Examples such as i. 89, *οἰκιαι αἱ μὲν πολλαὶ ἐπεπτώκεσαν δλίγαι δὲ περιῆσαν* and others quoted in Kühner ii. 287 are not really similar, for they are without the negative, which makes all the difference. Thucydides could not say 'Some, that is, none.' Nor will the Greek words bear the rendering 'Of others, none.' Or (ii.) to punctuate as Classen does, *οἱ δὲ τριῶν γε ἐτῶν, οὐδεὶς πλείω χρόνον ἐνόμιζον κ.τ.λ.* Then *τριῶν γε ἐτῶν* becomes a genitive of time; but the awkwardness of thrusting a genitive between two accusatives, *ἐνιαυτόν* and *πλείω χρόνον*, is manifest in such a passage.

But if we emend to *οἱ δὲ <τρεῖς>, τριῶν κ.τ.λ.*, the passage proceeds smoothly step by step to the climax *οὐδεὶς πλείω χρόνον*: the further correction *ἐνόμιζε* naturally follows, (*εν* having been written by dittography before *π*), agreeing with the Thucydidean practice of looking to the nearest subject. So the sentence will then run as emended:

ὅσον κατ' ἀρχὰς τοῦ πολέμου οἱ μὲν ἐνιαυτόν, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ <τρεῖς>, τριῶν  
 γε ἐτῶν οὐδεὶς πλείω χρόνον ἐνόμιζε κ.τ.λ.

S. C. BOOKER.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE,  
 OXFORD

The  
Heitlan  
may be  
any nev  
it is at  
way he  
express  
And wi  
Th  
familia  
retinue  
general  
general  
him. I  
scattere  
to 'retu  
moment  
tation s  
Vv

Str  
Francke

*corr.)* ||  
tinguit  
grantia  
7 nares  
|| dicit  
2 ex x)  
21 Iam

UTER.

γε ἐτῶν  
ιλοιεν ἐσ

the MSS  
or limita-  
n direct  
πολλαὶ  
are not  
difference.  
ords bear  
bes, *oi ðè*  
becomes a  
een two

proceeds  
correc-  
before π),  
ect. So

>, τριῶν  
DOKER.

## NOTES ON LUCAN VIII.

IN recent years important contributions to the interpretation of the eighth book of Lucan have been made by Professor Postgate (*C.Q.*, vol. I., pp. 75-79, 216-222), and by Mr. J. D. Duff (*Journ. of Phil.*, vol. XXXII., pp. 125-135). The following notes make a further attempt to solve some of the many problems presented by the book.

Vv. 5 sqq. [Pompey is fleeing to the coast after the battle of Pharsalia.]

Pauet ille fragorem  
motorum uentis nemorum, comitumque suorum  
qui post terga redit trepidum laterique timentem  
exanimat.

The clause *qui post terga redit* has caused a great deal of misgiving. Mr. Heitland (*C.R.* XI., p. 206 sq.) suggests with some diffidence that the reference may be to 'a scout in advance.' 'Every time the scout comes back to report any news from the front,' he says, 'Pompey is startled by the thought "here it is at last; our flight is cut off." But surely "anyone who comes back the way he went" (so Mr. Heitland explains *post terga redit*) is a strange way of expressing "anyone who returns after being sent on in advance as a scout." And with this explanation what is the force of *lateri timentem*?

The passage, however, becomes quite clear if we give to *comitum* the familiar technical meaning of the word. We often find *comites* applied to the retinue of chosen friends which accompanied a governor to his province, a general to the field, or a prince of the blood on his travels. In the case of a general they were a sort of half-official staff, in close personal attendance on him. Pompey's *comites*, then, whose proper place is by their leader, have been scattered in the battle and in the subsequent flight, and the survivors now try to 'return' to him. As each one comes up from behind, Pompey starts, and momentarily fears a cowardly stab in the side (*lateri timentem*). This interpretation seems to remove all difficulty about the meaning of *redit*.

Vv. 102 sqq. [Apostrophe of the dead Iulia by Cornelia.]

Vbicunque iaces, ciuibibus armis  
nostros ulta toros, ades hoc atque exige poenas,  
Iulia crudelis.

Strange difficulties have been felt about the meaning of *ubicumque iaces*. Francken explains it as 'sub inferis, siue in stygiis tenebris,'—an unnecessarily

far-fetched idea, which is not really supported by III. 12 (wrongly cited as II. 12 in his note). Oudendorp, following Beroaldus, takes *ubicumque iaces* with the previous words (*clades nunc denique lustra, Magne, tuas*), but this is impossible. Haskins' note is a curious one; *iaces*, he asserts, 'is equivalent to *uersaris*, for there was no doubt about the place of her burial.' Of course there was no doubt, and Cornelia's words do not imply that there was. All that they say is, 'No matter where' (or 'how far away') 'thou liest buried, come hither, and complete thy vengeance.'

Vv. 306-10.

Pompey is considering what alliances he might contract in order to repair his shattered fortunes. He decides that neither Juba nor Ptolemy is to be trusted; help must, therefore, be sought from the Parthians:

Quare agite, Eoum, comites, properemus in orbem (289).

After showing how formidable is the might of Parthia, he is seized with doubts and fears, and in vv. 306 sqq. exclaims:

O utinam non tanta mihi fiducia saeuis  
esset in Arsacidis! fatis nimis aemula nostris  
fata mouent Medos, multumque in gente deorum est.  
effundam populos alia tellure reuolsos,  
excitosque suis inmittam sedibus ortus.  
quod si nos Eoa fides et barbara fallent  
foedera, uolgati supra commercia mundi  
naufragium Fortuna ferat.

310

Dr. Postgate<sup>1</sup> has truly said that lines 309 sq., which assert Pompey's resolve to 'let loose the forces of the East' upon his enemies, are quite unintelligible as they stand, for in the lines immediately preceding and following we have an expression of grave misgiving as to the result of committing his destinies into the hands of such a people as the Parthians. The remedy suggested by Dr. Postgate is to place 309 sq. after 288. (Would they not come in more appropriately after 289, quoted above?) But there is a simpler cure. If we put a mark of interrogation after *ortus*, the sentence becomes quite natural and forcible. Lucan's fondness for rhetorical questions without particles to introduce them is apt to cause confusion, as Dr. Postgate has indicated (C.Q. I., p. 75, where he corrects the punctuation of VIII. 85, reading *illud amasti?*); cf. I. 299 sqq., III. 137 sq., IV. 215-219, VI. 153-156, 326 sq., IX. 1073-1076; also VIII. 793-796, quoted below.

Dr. Postgate finds *tanta* (v. 306) meaningless, and would read *tota*. But is it not conceivable that on thinking of the dangers of a Parthian alliance Pompey might exclaim, 'I could wish that my confidence in their might were not so great as to make me prefer their alliance (for they are dangerous as well as powerful, and might make themselves our masters)?'

<sup>1</sup> C. Q. vol. I., p. 78.

<sup>1</sup> Cf.  
fauoris

Vv. 701-708.

Hac Fortuna fide Magni tam prospera fata  
 pertulit, hac illum summo de culmine rerum  
 morte petit, cladesque omnes exegit in uno  
 saeuia die, quibus immunes tot praestitit annos,  
 Pompeiusque fuit, qui numquam mixta uideret  
 laeta malis, felix nullo turbante deorum,  
 et nullo parcente miser; semel impulit illum  
 dilata Fortuna manu.

705

No commentator seems to have taken the trouble to understand these lines, though Lucan has been at considerable pains to make his meaning clear. The great stumbling-blocks in the path of his readers seem to be *pertulit* (702) and *morte petit* (703). The latter difficulty has been caused partly by taking *hac* with *morte*. Certainly *hac morte petit* in this context would be intolerably weak; but surely we must supply with *hac* the word *fide* from the previous line: *hac fide . . . pertulit, hac (fide) . . . morte petit* is what Lucan says. *De culmine rerum petit* is a 'pregnant' construction, perfectly intelligible: 'assailed him so as to hurl him down from the pinnacle of his prosperity.' Such an expression is far from impossible in a language which can say *praefecti Capuam creari coepit* (Liv. IX. 20. 5). Thus conjectural emendation is needless; and indeed most of the suggestions made (e.g. *rapti*, *rotat*, *premit*) are not only unnecessary but open to objection in themselves, as being in the present tense, when it is rather a perfect that is wanted (*petit* here = *petiit*; cf. 85, 321, 422, etc.). Again, the use of *morte petit* has caused some misgiving. If it can be said of a man *petit excidiis urbem miserosque penates* (Verg. Georg. II. 505), surely *petit morte Pompeium* can be said of Fortuna. The expression is *feliciter audax* —which cannot be said for Burman's *monte premit!* Moreover, *morte* must be kept for a reason which will shortly appear.

The sense of the passage is as follows. 'This, then, was the kind of *fides* shown by Fortune to Pompey! She was simply holding her hand (*dilata manu*, 708) in order to strike him down when he was at the height of his prosperity (*culmine rerum*). Though it was hard for her to wait, she endured all his long triumphant career (*tam prospera fata pertulit*, 701 sq.); she suffered him to have unalloyed success (*numquam mixta uideret laeta malis*, 705 sq.), until the great day should come when at one fell stroke (*semel*, 707) she should hurl him down—not by a mere disaster to his cause, but by death itself (*morte*, 703). Thus she claimed in one day all the debt of calamities from which she had exempted Pompey before (703 sq.)<sup>1</sup> in order to make his fall the greater and the more sudden.

This summary will probably explain the meaning of the admirable *pertulit*, which has given rise to much talk and some useless 'emendation.' The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. v. 21 sq.; sed poenas longi Fortuna a similar but less extreme point of view. fauoris | exigit a misero. In II. 727 sq., we find

specious *perculit*, which has found favour in some quarters, would rob the passage of a most effective word. The last sentence, with its emphatic *semel* and *dilata*, gathers up the whole meaning of the lines in brief, trenchant language. It will now, perhaps, be clear that *morte* must be retained; when Fortune did at last strike, the blow brought not merely disaster, but death.

The lines may be roughly translated thus: 'Such, then, was Fortune's loyalty, whereby she endured all the glorious career of Magnus, and then assailed him and flung him down from the summit of prosperity, even by death, claiming, cruel one, in a single day all the calamities from which she suffered so many years to be exempt; and thus Pompey was one who never saw success mingled with ills, but as in his days of weal no god troubled him, so in his day of woe none spared him; for with one blow of a hand withheld till then did Fortune hurl him down.'

The passage would be almost equally effective if treated as a series of rhetorical questions. The general sense would not be changed, but the indictment of Fortuna would be less direct. In the latter part of this book, however, Lucan is bitterly cynical and defiant, even to the extent of impiety, and he even represents Pompey as harbouring similar feelings. This fact does not seem to have been sufficiently realized; hence great perplexity has arisen with regard to the two passages which will be considered next.

Vv. 663-667.

At Magni cum terga sonent et pectora ferro,  
permansisse decus sacrae uenerabile formae  
iratamque deis faciem, nil ultima mortis  
ex habitu uoltuque uiri mutasse fatentur  
qui lacerum uidere caput.

For *iratamque* Bentley suggests *certantemque* ('yying with'), Madvig *aequatamque*. Dr. Postgate<sup>1</sup> prefers *mirandamque*, as being palaeographically more probable. The objection brought against the MSS. reading is that it is inconsistent with the tranquil, majestic demeanour of Pompey as indicated by his last thoughts (622-635). But these last thoughts, so far from being inconsistent with *iratam deis faciem*, actually confirm the reading. Pompey is calm, but it is the calm of defiance. In 629 sqq. we read:

spargant lacerentque licebit,  
sum tamen, o superi, felix, nullique potestas  
hoc auferre deo.

Surely if ever words were full of defiance, these are. The scornful *o superi*, to which we shall shortly find a parallel in v. 861, and the emphatic *deo* have the same implication: 'They may dismember and mangle me, yet ye gods (who thought to bring me to the lowest depths of adversity), I am still blessed, and there is not a god that can take this glory from me.' The words of Cornelia, which follow, accuse the gods in plain terms: v. 642 sq., 'sed quisquis in

<sup>1</sup> C. Q. vol. I., p. 219.

istud |  
life and  
or less  
counter  
Turnus

L

and in

V

The  
not res  
so comp  
an apo  
without  
instanc  
is diffi  
sentenc  
words a  
the v  
interpre  
is not c  
Fortuna  
hardly r  
Duff ha  
to the a  
All  
rejected  
subject  
Fortuna  
seems to  
allowed  
tomb, o  
meliore  
(793 sq

<sup>1</sup> Of Lu  
(on IV. 1

istud | *a superis* inmisse caput. . . . Such sentiments are common enough in life and in literature, and Lucan's Pompey certainly does not seem less natural or less heroic for harbouring them in his heart and showing them in his countenance. Virgil less explicitly and more delicately says of the slain Turnus :

uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

Lucan himself is often *iratus deis*, as in the famous  
*uictrix causa deis placuit, sed uicta Catoni,*  
 and in many other passages.<sup>1</sup>

Vv. 858-861.

Nil ista nocebunt

famae busta tuae : templis auroque sepultus  
 uilior umbra fores ; nunc es pro numine summo  
 hoc tumulo, Fortuna, iacens.

This is the text as given by Hosius, and modern scholars, when they have not resorted to conjectural emendation, have naturally thought it best to follow so competent an authority. But it has been felt that the sudden change from an apostrophe of Pompey to one of Fortune is clumsy; it is not however without parallel in Lucan (I. 121-124, unless we emend 123, is a violent instance; cf. IV. 799 sqq., VIII. 548 sq.). More important is the fact that it is difficult to get a satisfactory or even an intelligible meaning out of the sentence *nunc . . . iacens*. Mr. J. D. Duff ingeniously attempts to make these words apply to Pompey by supposing that 'Lucan may have thrust in here the vocative *Fortuna* in the sense of "Fie! for shame! Fortune." ' This interpretation is, as its author virtually admits, a refuge of the desperate, for it is not easy to believe that even Lucan could have used the words *es . . . , Fortuna*, in the sense of 'Fie! Fortune! thou (Pompey) art . . .'; they could hardly mean anything but 'Thou, O Fortune, art.' But I believe that Mr. Duff has given us more than half the truth; for the remainder we must resort to the *apparatus criticus*.

All the best MSS. read, not *es*, but *est*. The reason why scholars have rejected this reading seems to be that they have construed *Fortuna* as the subject of *est*. I feel sure, however, that *est* is the correct reading, and that *Fortuna* is vocative, not nominative. The clue to the meaning of the passage seems to be given in the cynical lines 713 sq., where we are told that Fortune allowed Pompey a hasty burial on the seashore that he might not be without a tomb, *or rather to prevent him from having a better one* ('ne iaceat nullo uel ne meliore sepulchro'). A little later this gibe is directly addressed to Fortune (793 sqq.) :

Placet hoc, Fortuna, sepulchrum  
 dicere Pompei, quo condi maluit illum  
 quam terra caruisse sacer ?

<sup>1</sup> Of Lucan's invocations of the gods Francken ut h. l. habent apud L. aliquid acerbi.' (on IV. 192) says, 'Saepe inuocationes deorum

(*socer* at the end of the sentence = 'even Caesar.') Lucan now (860 sq.) delivers his final thrust. 'Ah, Fortune!' he says, 'that mean burial which was all that you would concede to Pompey has not overwhelmed him in nameless obscurity, as you wished; it has exalted him to the rank of a god.' I venture to think that Lucan's sudden savage turning upon Fortune after apostrophizing Pompey is more effective than awkward. It is in the same spirit as Pompey's unexpected *o superi* (630), which has already been mentioned, and it is thoroughly in keeping with the attitude toward Fortune which permeates the second half of the book and appears occasionally elsewhere.

The last three passages dealt with have been grouped together because of the connexion in their thought. We may now go back and consider another passage where the reading of the MSS. requires some defence.

Vv. 717-720. [The soldier Cordus recovers Pompey's body from the water.]

Ille per umbras  
ausus ferre gradum uictum pietate timore  
compulit ut mediis quaesitum corpus in undis  
duceret ad terram, traheretque in litora Magnum.

Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Postgate has pointed out a real difficulty.<sup>1</sup> He objects to the 'sheer and unredeemed tautology' of the last clause. According to his view, '*traheret* = *duceret*, *in litora* = *ad terram*, and *Magnum* = *quaesitum corpus*.' He therefore conjectures *reducem* for *traheret*; the introduction of this adjective, bearing the characteristic 'emphasis which Lucan throws on to single words,' would, he holds, redeem the passage from the charge of meaningless repetition.

As Dr. Postgate's words imply, tautology in Latin poetry gives no ground for suspicion unless it is 'sheer and unredeemed.' A second clause may repeat all or most of the contents of the previous clause, provided that it adds something to make the meaning clearer or fuller. No one says that Virgil could not have written

sedibus hunc refer ante suis, et conde sepulchro (*Aen.* VI. 152),  
even if (as is probable) *sedibus* refers to the *sepulchrum*. Nor does anyone impugn *Aen.* IX. 337 sq.,

felix, si protinus illum  
aequasset nocti ludum in lucemque tulisset.

But such instances are scarcely sufficient to justify so useless a tautology as is supposed to be found in the passage under consideration.

It may well be questioned, however, if we have here simply 'vain repetition'; indeed the traditional text seems to furnish that very 'emphasis on a single word' which the emendation mentioned above is designed to obtain. Surely *Magnum* is no mere reiteration of *quaesitum corpus*. Cordus was con-

<sup>1</sup> *C. Q.* I, p. 219.

60 sq.) which name-  
god.' I  
the after  
e same  
ntioned,  
which  
re.  
cause of  
another  
om the  
y.<sup>1</sup> He  
ording  
aesitum  
of this  
on to  
eaning-  
  
ground  
repeat  
s some-  
I could  
  
anyone  
  
utology  
  
repeti-  
s on a  
obtain.  
s con-

strained 'to draw the body to land, yea, to drag to the shore him that was called The Great.' *Hic situs est Magnus* (793) was the epitaph which he inscribed on Pompey's tomb; *Magnus* has here the same pathetic force. Again in v. 796 *Magnus* is more than a synonym of *Pompeius*:

Cur obicis Magno tumulum, manesque uagantis  
includis?

At the end of Book II. the poet thus concludes an apostrophe of Pompey:

Non quia te superi patrio priuare sepulchro  
maluerint, Phariae busto damnantur harenæ:  
parcitur Hesperiae; procul hoc et in orbe remoto  
abscondat Fortuna nefas, Romanaque tellus  
immaculata sui seruetur sanguine Magni.

It was certainly not the exigencies of metre that made Lucan speak of *Magnus* here, and not of *Pompeius*.

One other point may be mentioned. As the words *traheret in litora Magnum* in v. 720 are, save for the preposition and the number of the verb, identical with those used in v. 570 (*traherent ad litora Magnum*), Dr. Postgate supposes that the repetition in v. 720 is due to a scribe's reminiscence of the earlier passage. If the above defence of the ordinary reading carries conviction, it will seem more natural to attribute the reminiscence to the poet himself. It is, of course, unconscious, or 'sub-conscious.' Lucan was no more aware of repeating himself in v. 720 than was Virgil of introducing into one of his most solemn passages a reminiscence of the *Coma Berenices* (*Aen.* VI. 460; cf. Catullus, LXVI. 39). Other notable instances of unconscious repetition may be found at I. 82 and 93, *nec gentibus ullis*, IV. 264, *tunc inopes undae*, 292, *iamque inopes undae*, and perhaps VIII. 625, *fluxerunt prospera uitæ*, 631, *mutantur prospera uitæ*. Similar occurrences are not uncommon in prose; there is a peculiarly clumsy case in *Liv.* IX. 23. 8 sq. Repetitions of single words can perhaps hardly be used to support instances of repeated phrases, but when we find our author writing (IV. 426 sq.).

quod nec uela ferat, nec apertas uerberet undas.  
tunc freta seruantur, dum se decliuibus undis . . .,

and a little later (448-50),

At Pompeianus fraudes innectere *ponto*  
antiqua parat arte Cilix, passusque uacare  
summa freti medio suspendit uincula *ponto*,<sup>1</sup>

we shall be, perhaps, less inclined than ever to say that any repetition is impossible in Lucan.

W. B. ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY, MANCHESTER.

<sup>1</sup> In II. 143 sq., where *nocentes* appears at the end of each line, the repetition is intentional.

## ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE FRONTO CORRESPONDENCE.

OWING to the illegibility of parts of the Fronto palimpsest and the carelessness of its first editor, Cardinal Mai, it was impossible, even after the critical labours of Niebuhr and his colleagues, to come to any satisfactory conclusion as to the chronology of the Letters. But the edition of S. A. Naber in 1867, which had the advantage of a fresh collation of the MS. by G. N. Du Rieu, further reinforced subsequently by a new examination of the Codex due to W. Studemund, held out a better prospect of success. The labours of C. Brakman in the same direction, published in 1902, have also thrown fresh light upon the subject. Yet the critical world has long been awaiting the appearance of the authoritative recension by Professor E. Hauler of Vienna, who has spent infinite pains over a further, and what may well be a final, inspection of the Codex. A great desideratum, which it is much to be hoped that the new edition will supply, is an exact indication, as far as may be, of the extent of each lacuna in pages, lines, words, or letters. A knowledge of how much is lost in each case is essential for the true understanding of the sequence of thought and time in what remains.

The question of the chronology of the Letters has been discussed by Naber in the *Prolegomena* to his edition, by Mommsen in *Hermes* VIII. (1874) pp. 198 sqq., by Brakman in his *Frontoniana*, and, incidentally, by the writer of the article on Annius Verus in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*. But the last word has not yet been said, by any means, upon this difficult subject.

Only two letters out of the whole number supply us with an actual date. In *Ad Caes.* I. 8 (Nab. p. 23) Fronto speaks of Marcus as twenty-two years old, and in *Ad Caes.* IV. 13 (Nab. p. 75) Marcus 'blushes at the thought that, though twenty-five years old, his mind has made its own nothing in the way of true convictions and nobler principles of life.' Marcus was born on 26 April, 121, and therefore these two letters must have been written, the one between 26 April, 143, and 26 April, 144, and the other, similarly, between 146 and 147.

With these two dates as incidental props our whole scheme of chronology for that part of the correspondence which precedes the accession of Marcus will be found to depend largely upon the dates which can be fixed for two events, Fronto's consulship and the marriage of Marcus. The former of these has been satisfactorily determined. Fronto was *consul suffectus* during the

months of July and August, 143, giving Ausonius a handle for his jesting allusion to 'the consuls in whose consulship Fronto was consul,' one of these very consuls being the famous Herodes Atticus, himself a teacher of Marcus. Some of the earlier letters are concerned with the trial of Herodes, and the date of his consulship is not without its bearing on these.

About the second date above mentioned, the date of the marriage of Marcus, there has been some difference of opinion. Naber, followed by P. B. Watson in his *Life of Marcus Aurelius*, puts the marriage in 140, when Marcus was only nineteen. But the evidence for a later date is really overwhelming. The only doubt is whether the marriage took place in 146, as Schiller and others hold, or, as Klebs and the writer in Pauly-Wissowa's *Encyclopädie*, in 145. As the accurate fixing of this date is very important for our purpose, some space must be devoted to it and to the births of the children that were born to Marcus and Faustina.

Marcus was consul for the second time in 145, and Capitolinus (*Vit. Mar.* VI. 6) seems to imply that the marriage *followed* the consulship, and he associates the bestowal of the *Trib. Pot.* with the birth of a daughter as the first product of the union. The tribunician power of Marcus dates probably from 10 December, 146, though some fix the date as 1 January, 147, or even 25 February, 147. We know by an inscription found at Smyrna (*C. I. G.* 3176) that Marcus had a son, probably Titus Aelius Antoninus (Dessau II. 8803), born early in 147, who died before 28 March of that year. If therefore Capitolinus is correct in making Marcus's first child to be a daughter (Lacour-Gayet in his *Life of Pius* thinks *filia* should be *filio*), the marriage of Marcus must have taken place early in 145, and the daughter been born at the end of that year or the beginning of 146. With this agrees a coin of Ephesus (Mionnet, *Ionia*, 321) struck between the spring of 145 and the spring of 146, which bears the heads of Marcus and Faustina (here styled Augusta). Certain Roman coins, inscribed *Vota Publica* (Cohen 808, Eckhel VII. 46), dated in the second consulship of Marcus (not as Hobler in the first), confirm the same view. On them we see Marcus holding a roll in his left hand and Faustina with his right, while Juno Pronuba stands behind.

Twelve or thirteen children, six girls and the rest boys, a very large number for those days, were born before 167. But it is scarcely possible to give their dates of birth and the order in which they arrived. We have seen that a son was born and died early in 147. The daughter spoken of by Capitolinus as the first child was probably Annia Galeria Faustina, and we find her mentioned in *Ad Caes.* IV. 11 as *paruola nostra Faustina*. She was evidently a delicate child, and probably the *domnula mea*, who is mentioned as being ill in V. 24, refers to her. She is alluded to again in V. 19, but with a little sister, and seems to have died about 149. The sister must be Annia Lucilla (see also V. 30 and 33), who was married to Lucius Verus in 144, and most likely born in 148.

At the other end of the list we know that Commodus and his twin brother

Antoninus Geminus were born on 31 August, 161 (*Ad Ant.* I. 1, 3, 4); that the latter died in 164; that M. Annius Verus (or Severus) was born 162/3 and died 169/170, after being named Caesar with Commodus on 12 October, 166; and lastly that Vibia Aurelia Sabina, the youngest child, was born in 166, as we gather from Philostratus (*Vit. Soph.* II. 559), who tells us that a daughter of Marcus was aged three at the time of the trial of Herodes, which took place about 170.

Consequently between 148 and 161 we must find room for the birth of Arria Fadilla, who probably came next to Lucilla (see *paruolae nostrae* in V. 35, and *matronae nostrae* in V. 42); of Titus Aelius Aurelius and Titus Aurelius Antoninus, both of whom died in infancy; of Domitia Faustina, who died before 161; of Cornificia, who is mentioned in *Ad Ant.* I. 1; and of Hadrianus (*C.I.G.* 3709), though it is possible that he may be identical with Antoninus Geminus.

A minor point, that requires a passing mention, is the application of the term *Domina* in these letters. It could be used of Faustina the Elder, wife of Pius, of Domitia Lucilla, mother of Marcus, or of Faustina the Younger, his wife. But the elder Faustina died between 10 July, 140, and 10 July, 141. Lucilla did not die till about 156, and Faustina the Younger survived Fronto. They all lived together as members of the Imperial household. The word *Domina* often has *mater* attached to it, and then of course its reference is clear, but *Domina* alone may be either Lucilla or Faustina. In the second book, where however two-thirds of the letters are mutilated at the end and so lack the customary salutations, the word does not appear. In Book III. *Domina* always stands for Lucilla. In the first book the word occurs but once, *mea domina parens tua* (I. 3). It is only in the fifth book that any real difficulty is met with. Here, in the twenty-four cases of its use, Faustina seems to be meant twice as often as Lucilla.

Mommsen, who upheld the arrangement of the letters as being generally chronological, says that the earliest letters are not preserved, meaning apparently all before the year 143. It is clear that the letters in the first two books are arranged approximately in chronological order, and together with *Epist. Graec.* 1-3 and *Ad Pium* 1, 2 belong to the year 143. But the last two letters of Book II. (16, 17) are out of place, and, in spite of Naber's advocacy of the earlier date, must be referred to the year 162. These two letters with *Ad Amic.* I. 14 are on the subject of Matidia's will, and in the first of them mention is made of Faustina and her daughters. As we have seen, Faustina was not married till 145 at the earliest, and so these letters cannot belong to the years 143, as their position would lead us to expect. Moreover, as Matidia is mentioned in *Ad Ant.* II. 1, she could not have died till 161 or 162.

During the two months of Fronto's consulship were written the letters from I. 8 (which should be II. 1) to II. 11, the Greek letters to Lucilla, and *Ad Pium* I. 1, 2.

The only real crux in the first two books is the assumption of the title *Imperator* by Marcus in *Ad Caes.* I. 2. It is not easy to see how this could be correct before he was invested with the proconsular imperium in 147.

One would naturally take the letters in Books III. and IV. from their position to be later than 143, and as IV. 13, the last letter of that book, was certainly written between 146 and 147, to fall between 143 and 147. But many things militate against this supposition. The letters III. 2-6 relate to a trial of Herodes on serious charges connected with his conduct at Athens, and he could hardly have been elected consul with such charges hanging over his head. Consequently it must have been before 143 that he was arraigned, and most likely soon after arriving in Rome from Greece. The consulship would then naturally be the seal of his acquittal. Attempts have been made to connect this trial with the later and similar one in 169 or 170. The same accusers appear in both. But owing to the long interval between the two trials it would seem impossible to affiliate them. Philostratus in his account of Herodes (*Vit. Soph.* II. 549) tells us that the Athenians were much incensed against him at his sharp practice towards them in connexion with his father's legacy to the citizens of Athens. The words in Fronto (*Ad Caes.* III. 3) *dicendum est de filio impio et precum paternarum immemore* are generally taken of the son of Herodes, but apart from the difficulty of identifying this son, the words would be making a point in favour of Herodes himself as trying to restrain that son from his excesses. But that is contrary to the whole tenor of Fronto's remarks. Why then should not the expression *filio impio* mean Herodes himself, who disregarded his father's last wishes in respect to the legacy?

One or two considerations point to an early date for this batch of letters. For instance in III. 2 Marcus speaks of himself as an *audax puerulus*. Again Fronto seems not to have known that Herodes was a friend of Marcus and had even been brought up at his grandfather's house. Fronto must surely have been aware of this by 143, when Herodes and he were both consuls in the same year. So we may safely date these letters about 141-2.

Still earlier would appear to be the two Latin letters inserted among the *Epist. Graec.* (6 and 7) and the Ερωτικὸς λόγος (No. 8). The mention of his 'Caesar-speech' by Marcus fixes the date of these as 139 or 140. The early date of the letters at the beginning of Book III. is further indicated by the fact that *Epist. Graec.* 6, which we have just spoken of as most probably one of the earliest of all, is placed after III. 8 as well as among the Greek letters at the end of the work. But the first letter in Book III. presents a difficulty. The words, *tu cum in senatu uel in contione populi dicendum fuit, nullo uerbo remotoire usus es, nulla figura obscura aut insolenti*, point to a date when Marcus would be much more familiar with public speaking than he could have been in 140-142. As the letter is so fragmentary, dogmatism is out of the question, but perhaps this letter, like the two that precede it, has become misplaced.

In III. 7, 8, we find allusions to a speech of thanks by Marcus to Pius

which could hardly be anything except his speech as consul in 140. The twelfth letter of this same book, unfortunately mutilated, is an answer to two letters from Fronto. One of these is certainly III. 11, and the other would seem to be IV. 3, a long letter on the niceties of oratory, for Fronto writing in 162 (*Ad Ant. I. 2*) says: *Meministin eius orationis tuae quam uixdum pueritiam egressus in Senatu habuisti . . . meque primam illam longiusculam ad te epistulam scripsisse, qua id augurabar, magni ingeni signum esse ad eiusmodi sententiarum pericula audaciter adgredi?* Now IV. 3 is just such a lengthy epistle, and has that very recommendation of *audacia*. So in spite of Naber's view that the letter referred to by Fronto has been lost (see Nab. p. 97, note 2), it is extremely probable that he is referring to the third letter of Book IV. The writer on Annius Verus in Pauly-Wissowa would make the speech referred to Marcus's acknowledgment of the quaestorship in 138, but it is difficult to carry the correspondence between Fronto and Marcus so far back as that. If the view here put forward be correct, this letter (IV. 3) must be one of the earliest. As to the rest of Book III., viz. letters 13 to 21, they would naturally fall between 140 and 143, but one sentence in 13, *cum clam tot negotiis, quot officiis, quot rescribendis per prouincias litteris destringerere*, scarcely suits so early a stage in his pupil's career.

For Book IV. we have the *terminus ad quem* in its last letter, written when Marcus was twenty-five years old (146-147). The third letter of this book was, as we have seen, most probably a very early letter. So we may suppose the three which precede it to belong to the period before 143. Those that follow (4-10) may reasonably be dated between 143 and 147. The reference to the little Faustina in 11 throws that letter and 12, which is the answer to it, to the very end of 145 or the beginning of 146. The *paruola nostra Faustina* will be the Anna Galeria mentioned above.

With Book V., as Mommsen has already noted, the character of the correspondence changes. The letters are mostly much shorter, some being the briefest possible notifications of Fronto's aches and pains.

The distaste for the insincerities of oratory, of which there are traces in Marcus's previous letters (see *Ad Caes. III. 15*), shews itself in a more pronounced form in IV. 13, where we find him hankering after the *puriiores rationes* of philosophy. Fronto must have felt this defection of his favourite pupil deeply, and perhaps it tended to abridge their correspondence. Moreover Marcus, virtually now co-ruler with Pius, was becoming more and more occupied with affairs of state, while Fronto, who as he tells us himself (*Ad Amic. I. 18*) was a poor correspondent, must have found his power of letter-writing gradually curtailed by the burdens of age and increasing ill-health.

Book V. opens with the reference to a speech by Marcus, which can hardly be other than his speech of thanks for the *Trib. Pot.* in 147. In the index-title to a lost letter, V. (7), we find the first mention of Faustina by name. The name indeed occurs in II. 16, 17, but, as we have already seen, these two letters are certainly misplaced and belong to a later period when Marcus had

succeeded Pius. The mention in letter 19 of *paruolae nostrae* dates that letter as not earlier than 148, and it is most probable that Annia Lucilla was born in that year, her sister Annia Galeria being between two and three years old.

It is possible that letters 22–29 are misplaced, and belong to a period two years earlier. At all events 26 and 27 seem to be connected with IV. 13. Fronto had sent a theme on which he wished Marcus to compose speeches both for and against. This is exactly what Marcus in IV. 13 demurs to doing—*nam eadem de re diuersa tueri, numquam prosus ita dormiet Aristo, ut permittat*. Epistle 28 may be sequent to this episode, since it contains a request for an epideictic or ‘show’ thesis instead of a previous forensic one.

On reaching IV. 32, 33 we find only one daughter mentioned, so if the order is here chronological, we must conclude that Annia Galeria had died between V. 19 and V. 32. In V. 35 however a fresh reference to *paruolae nostrae* indicates the presence of a second little daughter. This would be most probably Arria Fadilla, whose birth we may put about 149.

Fronto’s proconsulship is alluded to in V. 36, and as at this period the proconsulship followed the consulship after an interval, generally speaking, of twelve to fifteen years, we reach a date about 155. The succeeding letters, V. 38, 39, mention a speech of L. Verus, which would most naturally be his speech of thanks for the consulship in 154. The *matronae nostrae* of V. 42 are again, no doubt, Lucilla and Fadilla. The mother of Marcus died probably in 156, and we find in V. 45 that her health, when that letter was written, was causing Marcus great anxiety. At the same time Faustina was near her delivery, and the child born (V. 52) was possibly Domitia Faustina. The rest of this book falls between 155 and 161, except the last letter, which from its different superscription and its mention of *γνῶμαι*—an early feature in Fronto’s educational scheme—would appear to belong to the period before 143.

The correspondence with Pius, apart from the first two letters, which have been already dealt with, gives no indication of date, but belongs to the period 145–161. The fourth letter is to Marcus, and is concerned, like *Ad Pium* 3 and 7, with the will of Niger Censorius, but we know nothing of this Niger. The will contained strictures against Gavius Maximus, who was *praef. pract.* to Pius from 140 till 157, in which year we may presume that he died. The letters would therefore not be later than that year.

The two books of letters *Ad Antoninum* seem in themselves to be arranged more or less in chronological order. To the letters in Book I. should be *Ad Caes.* added II. 16, 17. They come under the years 161–3, while Book II. covers the period between 162–6, though Mommsen would transfer Epistles 3, 4, 5 to the end of the book, and date them somewhat later.

The letters to Verus cover the years 161–166, but are not so chronologically arranged as those to Antoninus. For I. 2 mentions Apolaustus, who was only brought from Syria by Lucius in 166, and II. 6, 7 undoubtedly refer to the illness of Lucius at Canusium, when he had set out for Syria (*Capit. Vit. Ver. VI. 7*), and therefore cannot be later than 162.

Very few of the letters *Ad Amicos* admit of being accurately dated, but together with *Epist. Graec.* 4, 5 they appear to lie between the years 159 and 165.

The letters *De Feriis Alsiensibus* belong to 161, the *De Eloquentia* and *De Bello Parthico* to 162, the *Principia Historiae* to 164, the *De Nepote Amisso* to 165, and the *De Orationibus* to 166. The *Arion* and the three *Laudes* were early publications, and may perhaps be placed about 140.

Everything points to the fact that Fronto died before 169. As he was born at the end of Domitian's reign, he would be over seventy at that date, and his health was very precarious for many years at the end of his life, as we see from abundant evidence in his correspondence. There is nothing to be found in the letters that necessitates a later date for Fronto's death. There is indeed a reference in the *De Orationibus* to Commodus—*non malim mihi nummum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii*, and Mommsen, who takes this to refer to Commodus after his association in the Empire with Marcus in 177, is thus compelled to prolong Fronto's life till that year at least; but this seems less likely than to consider Commodus here to mean Commodus as Caesar only. He was named Caesar 12 October, 166. How indeed could Fronto have written to Marcus so late as 177 in these words, *dicas fortasse, quid in orationibus meis nouicium, quid crispulum, quid luscum . . .? nondum quicquam; sed uereor. . . . Not yet*, when Marcus was fifty-six, and had reigned sixteen years, and Fronto would have been eighty!

For the convenience of the reader I here subjoin a table grouping the letters under approximate dates but not determining the exact order of each letter or group.

SYNOPSIS OF CORRESPONDENCE ARRANGED AS FAR AS POSSIBLE IN  
CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER.

Year.		
139-140	...	<i>Epistulae Graecae</i> 6-8.
140-3	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> IV. 1-3.
"	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> III. (1) 2-12.
"	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> V. 59.
"	...	<i>Arion</i> and <i>Laudes</i> .
143 till June	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> I. 1-5.
143, July, August	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> I. 6-8.
"	"	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> II. 1-11.
"	"	<i>Epistulae Graecae</i> 1-3.
"	"	<i>Ad Pium</i> 1, 2.
143, after August	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> II. 12-15.
144-7	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> IV. 4-13.
"	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> III. (13) 14-21.
"	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> V. 22-29.
147-161	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> V. 1-21.
"	...	<i>Ad Caesarem</i> V. 30-58.

Year.	
147-161 ...	... <i>Ad Pium</i> 3-9 ( <i>Ad Pium</i> 7 = <i>Ad Amic.</i> II. 5).
" ...	... <i>Epistulae Graecae</i> 4, 5.
157-161 ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> I. 1-5.
161 ...	... <i>De Feriis Alsiensibus</i> 1-4.
161-2 ...	... <i>Ad Antoninum</i> II. 1-4.
" ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> II. 1-4.
" ...	... <i>Ad Antoninum</i> I. 1-5 (6-10).
" ...	... <i>Ad Verum</i> I. 13, 4.
" ...	... <i>De Bello Parthico, ad Marcum.</i>
" ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> I. 7-14.
162 ...	... <i>Ad Caesarem</i> II. 16, 17.
" ...	... <i>De Eloquentia, ad Marcum</i> 1-4.
" ...	... <i>Ad Verum</i> II. 6.
163-4 ...	... <i>Ad Antoninum</i> II. 3-6.
" ...	... <i>Ad Verum</i> II. 1, 2, 7.
163-6 ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> I. 15-25.
" ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> II. 6-11.
165-6 ...	... <i>Ad Verum</i> II. 3-5, 8-10.
" ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> I. 6.
" ...	... <i>Principia Historiae, ad Verum.</i>
" ...	... <i>De Nepote Amisso ad Marcum</i> 1, 2.
" ...	... <i>De Orationibus ad Marcum.</i>
" ...	... <i>Ad Verum</i> I. 2.
" ...	... <i>Ad Antoninum</i> II. 7, 8 (9).
" ...	... <i>Ad Amicos</i> I. 6.

Nothing is known of the history of this book of Fronto's correspondence, or who compiled it. It must have been a relation or friend, who perhaps had access also to the domestic documents of the Imperial House. That Fronto kept copies of his letters may perhaps be inferred from a reference in *Ad Ant.* I. 2 (quoted above), where he recalls a letter which he wrote twenty years before. But we can hardly suppose that he kept copies of such trivial notes as V. 12, 14, 17, etc., and, if not, these must have been recovered from the royal archives. If Fronto did not himself collect his letters for publication, the most likely person to have done so was Victorinus, his son-in-law, and the school-friend of Marcus (Capit. *Vit. Mar.* III. 10). As the letters are not placed entirely in chronological order, it would seem that the editor did not know their exact dates, but he was evidently well acquainted with the general circumstances of the correspondence.

The Codex, which we have in palimpsest condition, consisted originally of three volumes, of which the central one has been lost. Of the 680 pages which composed the whole work, 388 alone remain. The lost portion may have contained more letters of the later period when Marcus was Emperor, and if so their loss is the more to be deplored. Or, as some think, the

## 120 CHRONOLOGY OF THE FRONTO CORRESPONDENCE

speeches of Fronto may have been in the missing part. These we would gladly have recovered, for at present, besides the notorious passage on the Christians preserved by Minucius Felix, we have only one specimen of Fronto's oratory—namely, the long passage copied by Marcus (*Ad Caes.* I. 6). The late Professor Robinson Ellis in his address on Fronto, and more recently Miss Brock, however, state that no fragment of Fronto's speeches remains.

But even allowing for the loss of so great a part of the MS., we cannot help feeling surprised at the comparative meagreness of the collection, more especially in the section of letters to and from friends. Victorinus, though he was certainly away from Rome for a considerable time as *legatus* in Germany about 161 A.D., only appears four times. Letters between Fronto and L. Verus before the latter's association in the Empire would have been valuable as throwing light upon his position under Pius. It would have been interesting too to have the letters which Fronto wrote to his friends abroad about his proconsulship (see *Ad Pium* 8). It is disappointing to find Pius so poorly represented; and letters from Herodes, one of the best letter-writers of his time, would have been well worth having. But what has survived of the correspondence will repay study, and greater familiarity with it tends to correct the very disparaging estimate at first formed of its value.

C. R. HAINES.

GODALMING.

T  
which  
another  
an un  
to be  
P

C

I  
using  
there  
examini  
to an  
suffix  
it stan  
simply  
may b  
condu  
might  
we ar  
not ev

<sup>1</sup> Am  
Mr. Ull  
is to the  
in Horac  
Neaera  
Horace  
tempted

## NEAERA AS A COMMON NAME.

THERE are two undoubted instances of this use of *Neaera* in Prudentius which are cited by Mr. Ullman<sup>1</sup> in support of his contention that in Horace another proper name may be similarly employed. I imagine however that to an unprejudiced sense of Latin usage these instances will themselves seem to be strange and in need of explanation.

*Perist. X. 239 sq. (ed. Dressel, of Hercules and Omphale)*

fusos rotantem cernimus Tirynthium :  
cur si *neaerae* non fuit ludibrio ?

*Contra Symmachum I. 135 sqq. (of Bacchus and Ariadne)*

Hoc circumsaltante choro temulentus adulter  
inuenit expositum secreti in literis acta  
corporis egregii scortum quod perfidus illic  
liquerat incesto iuuenis satiatus amore.  
hanc iubet adsumptam feruens post uina *neaeram*  
secum in deliciis fluitantis stare triumphi  
regalemque decus capitis gestare coronam.

It is clear that the Christian writer is speaking in bitter contempt and using an opprobrious expression for a 'meretrice' or 'lasciuia femina.' Now is there anything in *Neaera* or its history which will account for this? Let us examine the possibilities. And first that offered by etymology. According to an accepted and plausible derivation the name is formed, by means of a suffix very commonly used to denote females, from the stem *νεαρό-*, to which it stands in the same relation as *χιμαιρα* to *χιμαρός*. The word should then simply mean 'young woman,' and we are taken no nearer to our goal. But it may be thought that it acquired its objectionable colour through the reputed conduct of some particular *Neaera* of legend or history, just as *Helene* or *Thais* might have been used to express any *meretrice* or *lasciuia femina*. But here too we are stopped. None of the nine legendary bearers of the name chronicled, not even the eloping wife of the Milesian Hypsikreon (no. 8 in Roscher's

<sup>1</sup> *American Journal of Philology XXXIII.* p. 457. Mr. Ullman's words are 'an exact parallel' (that is to the use which he supposes *Glycera* to have in Horace *Odes I. 33*) 'is to be found in the use of *Neaera* (one of the names, by the way, that Horace uses) by Prudentius, etc.'—I might be tempted to use this opportunity to rebut the

charge of misrepresentation of his theories which Mr. Ullman there puts forward; but the considerateness of the Editor in allowing Mr. Ullman's complaints to follow immediately upon my paper ('Albius and Tibullus,' ib. pp. 450-455) has happily made this unnecessary.

Lexikon), nor the hetaira whom the pseudo-Demosthenes attacked can be assumed to have had the notoriety that would entitle them to this particular distinction. The only possibility remaining is that this word derived its signification through association with another word of the same or similar form.

By the feminine of *νεαρός* stands a second *νειαίρα* or *νέαιρα*, a cognate of *νειάτος* or *νέατος* (= *ἔσχατος*, *nouissimus*). On this word—which is found in Homer as an attribute to *γαστήρ*, e.g. in *Il.* 16. 465 τὸν βάλε νειαίραν κατὰ γαστέρα (that is ‘uentris inferiorem partem’ τὸ ἔσχατον τῆς κοιλίας *Et. or.* p. 108. 25) and in the medical writers, with and also without the substantive (e.g. Hippocrates 215 οὐρὸν ἀπόληψις καὶ βάρος ἐν νειαίρῃ σημαῖνε εἰς τὰ πολλὰ στραγγούριαν ἐσομένην: Callimachus *Fr. ap. Stob. Flor.* 81. 8 νειαίρην εἰς ἀχάριστον)—Eustathius *Il.* p. 580. 21 has preserved an instructive notice *νέαιρα γαστήρ* οὐ μόνον δί’ ἡς τὰ σιτία νέονται, ὅ ἐστι πορεύονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἔσχατη δύθεν καὶ ἡ γυναικεία ὑστέρα μετείληπται.<sup>1</sup> To this use language furnishes numerous parallels, as *νηδύς*, *uenter*, *alius* and *γαστήρ* itself.

The signification here vouched for by Eustathius is sufficient to account for the sense of *neaea* which we are considering; and its appearance in connexion with a proper name may be illustrated from names of women occurring in Attic inscriptions: *Χοιρίη*, *Χοιρίνη*, *Χοιρίς*, *Χοιρίδιον*, *Χοιρώ*.<sup>2</sup> For the references to the inscriptions see F. Bechtel, *Die Attischen Frauennamen* p. 90. Another ex. is *Κοχλίς*; compare Plaut. *Rud.* 704 with its play on *concha*. Bechtel seems right in adding *Μελαινίς*, comparing Herodas I. 79 with Athen. 86 A παρὰ Σάφρου δὲ κόγχοι μελαινίδες λέγονται. *Δελφίς*, a hetaira in Lucian *Ἐτ. διάλ.* XIV. 1, *Delphium* in Plautus *Mostellaria* may, as Bechtel suggests, carry a similar implication (cf. *δελφύς*). The strange Latin name *Suaulula* in Nos. 264, 265 of Audollent's collection of *Defixiones* is, I should conjecture, another example, being simply a contraction of *Sua(ui)-nulua*. Lastly there may be cited the use of *cunnus* = *impudica*, for which two places in Horace are quoted, S. I. 2. 36 and 3. 107, though for this purpose they are not quite conclusive. The expression in the last passage ‘nam fuit ante Helenam cunnus taeterrima belli | causa’ stands in such sharp antagonism to that of Propertius II. 3. 35 sqq. ‘olim mirabar quod tanti ad Pergama belli | Europae atque Asiae causa puella fuit. | . . . digna quidem facies pro qua uel obiret Achilles. | uel Priamo belli causa probanda fuit’ that I think the contradiction between the two places something more than an accident.

<sup>1</sup> His comment on *Il.* 5. 616 I subjoin, though less relevant to our present purpose, *νειαίραν κάνοαιθα γαστέρα φησίν* ἡ τὸ τῆς γαστρὸς *νειάτον* ἦγουν ἔσχατον ἡ ἐπιθετικῶς δὲ ἡς νίονται τὰ σιτία καθὰ προσιηται. καὶ ἐστι τὸ ἀπάθες *νέαιρα* δὲ καὶ κύριόν ἐστι παρὰ τοὺς ὕστερον ὄνομα. παρὰ τὸ *νέα* μέντοι ἔκεινο ἵνα δηλοῖ τὴν *νεαράν* ὥ τις ἐτὶ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀστείσται διὰ τὸ ἴνδελεχῶς *νεάζειν* αὐτὸν

εἰς ὄφεξιν· ἐστι δὲ καὶ παρ’ Ὁμήρῳ ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ κύριον ὄνομα *Νέαιρα*. The reference is to *Od.* 12. 133 Φαιθονσά τε λαμπετίν τε | ἄς τίκεν Ἡελίῳ Τεπρίονι διὰ *Νέαιρα*.

<sup>2</sup> From *χοῖρος*; cf. Varro *R. R.* II. 4. 10 ‘nam et nostrae mulieres, maxime nutrices, naturam qua feminas sunt in virginibus appellant porcum, et Graecae choeronom.’

J. P. POSTGATE.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

January 19, 1914.

## THE CAESVRA IN VIRGIL, AND ITS BEARING ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE PSEUDO-VERGILIANA.

IN the heroic Latin hexameter, after the essential alternation of long and short syllables, by far the most important feature is unquestionably the caesura. Nevertheless, ancient writers on metre dismiss it with the most cursory notice; all we get from them is that the chief caesura is the penthemimeral, the trochaic and hephthemimeral coming next; the fourth trochaic and the bucolic are usually rejected, and the trihemimeral is mentioned only by Ausonius. Modern writers, among whom are Müller and Winbolt, deal with the question at greater length, but do not agree even on fundamental points, and often base their statements on an insufficient analysis of the extant remains of Latin hexameter verse. The purpose of the following paper is to attempt a more complete analysis, at least in the case of Virgil, the acknowledged master of the Latin hexameter. But before we proceed further there are two preliminaries which must be settled—what are the main types of caesura, and how many caesurae are admissible in one verse?

Of the six varieties of caesura recognized by ancient authorities, the fourth trochaic only occurs as the chief caesura four times in all Latin literature, and may therefore be ignored; and the bucolic, as its name implies, may be neglected in Heroic verse. Moreover in any verse of ordinary length it is a *sine qua non* of the caesura that it should divide the line approximately in half. This is not the case either with the trihemimeral or the bucolic, which may therefore be excluded from further consideration as main caesurae. There remain only the penthemimeral, the trochaic, and the hephthemimeral caesurae. As regards the penthemimeral and the trochaic, the presence of either practically excludes the other. Either of them however may, and often does, occur in conjunction with the hephthemimeral. Indeed the two combined forms,

arma uirumque cano || Troiae | qui primus ab oris  
infandum regina || iubes | renouare dolorem,

are as common as almost any other type.

It is not easy to determine whether such lines should be regarded as having one caesura or two, and if only one is to be allowed, which should take the precedence. Most modern authorities however would probably agree that

one line can have only one main caesura, and we shall therefore assume this as at least a working hypothesis. Furthermore, by consent of all writers, ancient and modern, the penthemimeral is the chief caesura, and thus takes precedence of the hephthemimeral. In cases such as the second however the question is more difficult. Ancient writers differ as to whether the trochaic or the hephthemimeral caesura should take precedence, and in modern criticism great names, such as Meyer and Müller, may be found on opposite sides. Either caesura can stand alone, and though the hephthemimeral is found alone more frequently than the trochaic, its superiority in this respect is insufficient to determine the question of precedence.

Perhaps the best argument in favour of the trochaic caesura is that it is natural to accept the first available caesura in the verse. For instance, in a line beginning

infandum regina

we have no certainty that another caesura will follow, so that we should naturally adopt the first caesura as the principal one, and consider any other that may follow as subsidiary.

In the following analysis therefore we shall accept the penthemimeral as the normal type; failing that the trochaic; and only where both are absent shall we allow the hephthemimeral to be the main caesura. This is the most convenient arrangement, though in a large measure arbitrary.

Let us now take these three types in order. The simplest as well as the most common is the penthemimeral caesura, which occurs in about the same ratio throughout Virgil's works, in from 84½ to 86½ per cent. of his lines. Besides the strictly normal type of

luctus et ultrices || posuere cubilia Curiae,

there is one variant form which has not hitherto been commented on by any writer, although Virgil uses it more often than any of his successors, and indeed more often than any writer except Lucilius. This is the elided caesura—

Gorgones Harpyiaeque | et forma tricorporis umbrae.

This elided form is extremely rare in the *Elegies*, but occurs about once in every 25 lines throughout the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. It is noticeable that in about two-thirds of these cases it is an enclitic *-que -ue* or *-ne* that is elided. Where the elision is harsher than this there is almost always a hephthemimeral break. To this rule there are only 37 exceptions, as against 180 lines which conform to it; whereas where the elided syllable is an enclitic there are nearly 200 lines which have no hephthemimeral break. Indeed Virgil, especially in the *Aeneid*, prefers to dispense with it in such a case, usually following the elision with a Molossus.

The trochaic caesura has a definite and even complicated model type. Virgil and all his successors felt it to be weak, and therefore usually supported it by a trihemimeral break, and followed it with an iambic word, thus adding

a hep  
1,497

Only  
specia

T

may  
Lucre

Virgil

with  
the ch  
it fell  
great  
decess  
every

the he  
dealt w  
Compon  
hephth  
word b  
moreov  
alterna  
im-mod  
the latt

D

or with

Le  
mimera  
investig

<sup>1</sup> Dr. V  
Scholarshi  
in such  
trihemim

a hephthemimeral pause as well. Thus the normal type, found in 1,329 of the 1,497 lines of Virgil with trochaic caesura, is

sit mihi fas | audita || loqui, | sit numine uestro.

Only 6 lines are without either support, and all are designed to give some special effect, such as

falleret indepresus et irremeabilis error.

The trihemimeral break is omitted 114 times, usually for a dactylic pause  
orgia | nocturnusque || ciet.<sup>1</sup>

The iambic word is less often dispensed with, only 60 times in all. We may notice that of these only 8 are of the abrupt spondaic type dear to Lucretius, which resembles too closely the end of a hexameter:

innumerum uersantque || tenaci.

Virgil's most common variation is exemplified by :

luna premit suadentque || cadentia.

The hephthemimeral caesura as a subsidiary form is frequent, being found with 9 trochaic caesurae out of 10, and with 5 out of 7 penthemimerals, but as the chief caesura it occurs only about once in 30 lines. With the Silver Age it fell still more into disuse, and only Juvenal and Silius employed it even to as great an extent as Virgil. It had found much more favour with Virgil's predecessors. Ennius, Lucilius, Lucretius, and Cicero all employed it once in every 15 to 25 lines, but apparently it was too harsh for later ears.

There remains the difficult question whether there was a standard form of the hephthemimeral as of the trochaic caesura. The point has not been fully dealt with, but Dr. Verrall suggests in his article on *The Metrical Division of Compound Words in Virgil*<sup>2</sup> that, besides a trihemimeral break, the normal hephthemimeral caesura requires an elision after two feet, and that the last word before the caesura should be of the scansion --- or - - -. It should moreover be a compound word, divisible after the first syllable (or as an alternative the second syllable in the scansion - - -), for instance *ab-iectos*, *im-modico* or *inter-erat*, the former giving a quasi-penthemimeral caesura and the latter a quasi-trochaic. The sole exception is that of proper names.

Dr. Verrall's normal type is therefore :

obstipuit | primo a-spectu || Sidonia Dido,

or with a proper name,

interea | media Aeneas || freta classe secabat.

Let us consider these characteristics in order. The first, the trihemimeral break, is analogous to what we find in the trochaic caesura, and on investigation we are not surprised to find it present in 88 per cent. of Virgil's

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Verrall, in his *Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship*, expresses tentatively the theory that in such cases a compound word giving quasi-trihemimeral pause was required. This is how-

ever only so in 59 cases, and is not found in 32; the remaining 23 contain names, and so give no evidence either way.

<sup>2</sup> *Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship*, p. 243.

hephthemimeral caesurae, and to a greater or less degree in those of all other Latin writers. We may therefore accept the trihemimeral break as normal.

But if we are to accept Dr. Verrall's second and third characteristics, the hephthemimeral caesura assumes an extremely complicated form. It demands in fact a compound word, of scansion --- or - - -, beginning with a vowel, and preceded by a word of scansion - - - or --, whose last syllable must be capable of elision. Such a combination seems too much to expect, even if we accept a proper name as an equivalent for the compound word. Yet in examining the lines of Virgil's works which have the hephthemimeral as the main caesura, we find that 40 per cent. are completely normal, while another 15 per cent. are normal, except that a name takes the place of the compound word, and another 10 per cent. contain names which are not preceded by an elision. In fact only about one-third are abnormal without apparent reason. How do we account for this fact?

It is easy to explain the large percentage of examples in which the divergence is due only to proper names. It so happens that most of the principal names of the *Aeneid*, *Aeneas*, *Euander*, *Ausonii*, and *Italia* in its oblique cases, begin with a vowel and are of the requisite scansion, a form which can only find a place in two or three other positions in the verse. As to the other cases, it is true that Latin has a large number of compound words of suitable form, but not enough to account for their predominance. The facts seem to be as follows. Virgil feels that the hephthemimeral caesura comes too late in the verse to stand unsupported—that in fact the first half of the verse is too long. An elision at the end of the second foot gives the illusion of a penthemimeral caesura; *Interea medium* is the normal caesura, until *Aeneas* is added and elides the final syllable. A break in the middle of a word, after the first syllable of the third foot, aids this semblance of a normal caesura, and lightens the burden which the hephthemimeral caesura alone cannot carry. As a rule Virgil adopts one or both of these artifices; if we exclude proper names, we find that less than 7 per cent. of hephthemimeral lines are without either. Moreover compound words of the requisite scansion, beginning with a vowel, are more common and more useful than the corresponding uncompounded words.<sup>1</sup> Thus the hephthemimeral caesura cannot normally stand alone, but needs the assistance of the trihemimeral break and also of a quasi-penthemimeral break. Virgil however is much too good an artist to abide by any hard-and-fast rule, such as delighted the post-Augustan versifiers. He freely dispenses with either, though never with both of these artifices. There are only two lines of Virgil which have no caesura of any recognized type. These are

*Aen.* XI. 758. portat ouans ducis ex-emplum e-uentumque secutus

*Aen.* XII. 144. magnanimi Jouis in-gratum a-scendere cubile.

<sup>1</sup> In the 1,000 lines of Virgil beginning *Aen.* IV. 1 there are 272 words beginning with a vowel, and scanning - - -, or ---. Of these 136 are compound words of the requisite type, while 75 are indivisible words, and 61 are names.

It will be seen that in both these lines the absence of the caesura is obscured by three subsidiary breaks:

1. The trihemimernal break.
2. A quasi-penthemimernal break formed by a compound word divisible in the middle of the third foot.
3. A quasi-hephthemimernal break given by a compound word divisible in the middle of the fourth foot preceded by an elision.

These or similar artifices are invariably used by all Latin poets after Lucretius when the regular caesura is omitted. A normal caesura is however only omitted in 31 lines in the whole of Latin hexameter verse, and of these 16 are pre-Virgilian.

It will be seen therefore that Virgil does follow very definite rules in his treatment of the caesura, rules which he only breaks on particular occasions with particular objects in view. A trochaic caesura he supports by the trihemimernal and hephthemimernal break, a hephthemimernal caesura by a trihemimernal break, and some modified form of penthemimernal caesura. In this he differs very decidedly from his predecessors, who had no such standards; while his successors stereotype his canons and use the different forms in varying proportions, but neither introduce any really new form, nor entirely abandon any of those he introduced. He is therefore unquestionably the originator of the accepted forms of caesuræ.

Furthermore we have in his style, as will be seen from Tables I. and II., an unmistakable development through the three epochs of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, though we are unable to trace it in the subdivisions of these works.<sup>1</sup>

Penthemimernal lines are about equally frequent throughout; but the elided type, scarcely found in the *Eclogues*, comes strongly into favour, and, as already mentioned, is more and more usually accompanied by a hephthemimernal break if the elided syllable is anything but an enclitic, while if it is an enclitic a second break is generally dispensed with. The hephthemimernal increases considerably in frequency throughout, and becomes more regular except for the inevitable number of irregularities due to names in the *Aeneid* and a slight increase of lines without the trihemimernal pause. The trochaic type develops less; it is however slightly more regular, especially in being more often followed by a hephthemimernal pause.

In fact Virgil, while varying his rhythm more and more as his style develops, does so in his later works not by violent and unusual caesuræ, but by an increasing frequency of what may be called normal abnormalities.

Since Virgil followed such very definite rules for the caesura, and showed so marked a gradation of style, it should be possible to use this as a criterion,

<sup>1</sup> A comparison and analysis of the separate books of the *Aeneid* does not give any results worthy of note, except that the hephthemimernal caesura becomes slightly more rare from first to last, and that the twelfth book shows an unusually large number of trochaic and elided penthemimernal lines.

or at least as an additional indication of the authenticity of any work attributed to him.

In the pseudo-Vergilian *a* the difficulties are increased by the corrupt state of the text, so corrupt that emendations often completely alter the rhythm. The analysis shown in Table III. however gives some interesting results, which, though necessarily inconclusive, make it probable that the *Culex* and perhaps the *Moretum* are genuine, while the other hexameter poems are not.

The *Lydia* and the *Dirae* are too short to give us anything to go upon. Both are exceedingly monotonous, and the latter especially is not unlike Cicero's work, with a very low percentage of trochaics, and those very irregular. In the *Dirae* 3 out of 6 are irregular, while 19 out of the 30 trochaic caesurae in Cicero's extant verse are of abnormal type.

The *Moretum* is also too short to give much result. Suffice it to say that there is no strong evidence against its being an early work of Virgil; it has no elided penthemimerals, and only one hephthemimeral, of type F. Otherwise the proportions are what we should expect.

Even in ancient times the *Aetna* was generally considered to be falsely attributed to Virgil. The trochaic caesura appears in 15 per cent. of the lines, an increase on Virgil which betokens a later date. The hephthemimeral caesura is rare, under 1 per cent. One would be disposed on the whole to consider it the work of a later writer who was thoroughly acquainted with Virgil's work, but copied him in a rather mechanical way without being able to suppress the influence of his own age.

There remain, excluding the elegiac *Copa* and epigrammatic fragments, only the *Ciris* and the *Culex*, both extremely corrupt. The *Ciris* has at first sight a Virgilian appearance, but the characteristics are against its authenticity. Hephthemimeral caesurae are extremely rare, there are but few trochaic caesurae, and we have four non-iambic variations of the trochaic caesura, three of which are of the spondaic type of

spelaeum multoque || cruentas,

common in Lucretius, but only found 8 times in all Virgil's works.

As to the *Culex*, there is no evidence against its authenticity, and much in its favour. The caesurae are exactly what we should expect from Virgil at a period just before the *Eclogues*. Elided penthemimeral caesurae are rare as in the *Eclogues*, hephthemimeral are frequent, and though there are none of completely normal type, 8 show the divided word giving a quasi-penthemimeral effect.

The unsupported hephthemimeral of line 357

fluctuat omnis in aequoreo

has no parallel in Virgil, but the manuscripts vary, some of them giving  
omnis in aequoreo fluitat.

We sh  
which

*Eclog  
Georg  
Aene*

To

*Eclog  
Georg  
Aene*

T

A  
B  
suader  
C

*Eclog  
Georg  
Aene*

To

D  
E  
F  
G  
H  
K

I  
trihem

<sup>1</sup> Dr  
Verfassu  
metrica

We shall therefore probably be justified in accepting this as the genuine *Culex* which Virgil is known to have written.<sup>1</sup>

TABLE I.—ANALYSIS OF THE CAESVRA IN VIRGIL'S WORKS.

	Total Lines.	Penthemimeral.		Trochaic.		Hephthemimeral.		No Caesura.
		Normal.	Elided.	Normal.	Abnormal.	Normal.	Abnormal.	
<i>Elegues</i> ...	830	708	4	91	16	4	7	0
<i>Georgics</i> ...	2,188	1,803	88	201	33	30	33	0
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	9,878	7,853	496	1,037	119	145	226	2
Total ...	12,896	10,364	588	1,329	168	179	266	2

TABLE Ia.—ABNORMAL TROCHAICS.

	A.	B.	C.
<i>Elegues</i> ...	7	7	2
<i>Georgics</i> ...	16	17	0
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	85	30	4
Total ...	108	54	6

A = No trihemimeral break; e.g. *orgia nocturnusque ciet*.

B = No iambus after the caesura, i.e. no hephthemimeral break; *luna premit suadentque cadentia*.

C = A and B combined; *spargens umida mella soporiferumque*.

TABLE Ib.—ABNORMAL HEPHTHEMIMERALS.

	D.	E.	F.	G.	H.	K.
<i>Elegues</i> ...	1	1 (1)	2	1	2	1
<i>Georgics</i> ...	8 (1)	7	8	7	1	3
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	30 (3)	51 (3)	21	44	55 (9)	43 (3)
Total ...	39 (4)	59 (4)	31	52	58 (9)	47 (3)

D = An indivisible word; e.g. *conuenit quando armatas*.

E = No elision; e.g. *coniciunt furit immissis*.

F = D and E combined; e.g. *nec ripas datur horrendas*.

G = No trihemimeral break; e.g. *obruit Auster aqua inuoluens*.

H = Name with elision; e.g. *dixerat et dicta Ilioneus*.

K = Name without elision; e.g. *accelerat simul Aeneas*.

In this table the figures in brackets indicate the number of lines also showing no trihemimeral caesura; i.e. of the G type as well.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lederer in his pamphlet *Ist Vergil der Verfasser von Ciris und Culex?* working on purely metrical grounds quite apart from the question

of the caesura, comes to the same conclusion, that the *Culex* is, while the *Ciris* is not, a genuine work of Virgil.

TABLE II.—PERCENTAGE ANALYSIS OF CAESVRAE IN VIRGIL'S WORKS.

	Penthemimeral.	Trochaic.	Hephthemimeral.
<i>Eclogues</i> ...	85·8	12·9	1·3
<i>Georgics</i> ...	86·4	10·7	2·9
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	84·5	11·7	3·8
Average... ...	85·0	11·6	3·4

TABLE IIa.—PERCENTAGE OF ABNORMAL TROCHAIC LINES.

	A.	B.	Abnormal in any Way.
<i>Eclogues</i> ...	8·4	8·4	15·0
<i>Georgics</i> ...	6·8	7·3	14·1
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	7·7	3·0	10·2
Average ...	7·6	4·0	11·2

TABLE IIb.—PERCENTAGE OF PENTHEMIMERAL LINES WITH ELISION.

<i>Eclogues</i> ...	...	...	...	...	0·6
<i>Georgics</i> ...	...	...	...	...	4·7
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	...	...	...	...	5·9
Average ...	...	...	...	...	5·4

TABLE IIc.—PERCENTAGE OF ABNORMAL HEPHTHEMIMERAL LINES.

	D and F Indivisible.	E and F no Elision.	F Type.	G Tri-hemimeral.	H and K due to Names.	Abnormal in any Way.
<i>Eclogues</i> ...	27·3	27·3	18·2	9·1	27·3	63·5
<i>Georgics</i> ...	25·4	23·8	12·7	11·1	6·3	52·4
<i>Aeneid</i> ...	13·7	19·4	5·6	11·8	26·4	60·9
Average	15·5	20·9	6·9	11·7	23·6	59·7

TABLE III.—ANALYSIS OF THE CAESVRA IN THE PSEUDO-VIRGILIANA.

	Total Lines.	Penthemimeral.		Trochaic.		Hephthemimeral.		No Caesura.
		Normal.	Elided.	Normal.	Abnormal.	Normal.	Abnormal.	
<i>Lydia</i> ...	80	75	1	4	0	0	0	0
<i>Dirae</i> ...	101	93	1	3	3	0	1	0
<i>Moretum</i> ...	124	105	0	16	2	0	1	0
<i>Aetna</i> ...	644	529	9	89	11	3	3	0
<i>Ciris</i> ...	541	477	9	44	5	3	3	0
<i>Culex</i> ...	412	347	2	47	3	0	13	0

## THE CAESVRA IN VIRGIL

131

TABLE IIIa.—ABNORMAL TROCHAICS IN THE PSEUDO-VIRGILIANA.

		A.	B.	C.
<i>Lydia</i>	...	o	o	o
<i>Dirae</i>	...	i	2	o
<i>Moretum</i>	...	i	i	o
<i>Aetna</i>	...	9	2	o
<i>Ciris</i> ...	...	i	4	o
<i>Culex</i>	...	3	o	o

TABLE IIIc.—ABNORMAL HEPHTHEMIMERALS IN THE PSEUDO-VIRGILIANA.

	D.	E.	F.	G.	H.	K.
<i>Lydia</i>	o	o	o	o	o	o
<i>Dirae</i>	i	o	o	o	o	o
<i>Moretum</i>	o	o	i	o	o	o
<i>Aetna</i>	o	i	o	2	o	o
<i>Ciris</i>	o	i	o	i	o	i
<i>Culex</i>	o	9	3	o	o	i

*Text used*—For *Aetna*, Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*.

For the other poems, Ribbeck's large Teubner edition.

W. G. D. BUTCHER.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

practica  
quoque  
The  
of town  
'Quid e  
to ans  
senator  
precede  
means,  
provinc

On  
explain  
Italian  
in the  
memb  
dragge  
provinc

I  
can m  
favour  
view o

W

## CLAVDIVS AND THE PRIMORES GALLIAE.

THIS old difficulty has recently received a new explanation from the pen of Dr. E. G. Hardy (*Roman Laws and Charters*, pp. 133<sup>1</sup> sqq.). Dr. Hardy believes—and his view has met with some acceptance—that the disability, under which these Gallic candidates for admission to the Senate laboured, was the want of a *municipalis origo*. Up to this time, he contends, only Romans who were members of a town of Roman or Latin rights were eligible for admission to the Senate. Now in the Tres Galliae there were practically no such towns: these Gallic chiefs possessed the *civitas* individually by special grant and not as members of any municipality. Hence the door of the curia was closed to them while it was open to Romans from Lugdunum or Vienna.

I venture to think that this explanation is quite untenable. Several general considerations might be urged against it, but, what is more important, the one piece of evidence which Dr. Hardy can produce in support of it gives it, in my opinion, no support whatever. It is the following passage from the speech of Claudius (col. ii.):

Sane nouo m[ore] et diuus Aug[ustus au]unc[ulus m]eus et patruus Ti. Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum et municipiorum, bonorum scilicet hominum et locupletium, in hac curia esse voluit. Quid ergo? Non Italicus senator prouinciali potior est? . . . Sed ne prouinciales quidem, si modo ornare curiam poterunt, reiciendos puto.

Dr. Hardy giving *ubique* its full force translates 'throughout the Empire,' and apparently thinks that the colonies and *municipia* alluded to are those in the provinces. But the phrase 'coloniae et municipia' is constantly used of Italian towns, and so comes to be an equivalent for 'Italy' (e.g. *Lex Agraria* 31, *Sallust Cat.* 17 and 58, *De Bello Gallico* VIII. 50, *Mon. Anc.* 21). The use is specially frequent in Tacitus (*Ann.* I. 79, III. 55, IV. 67, XV. 33, *Hist.* II. 20, 56, 62). In most of these passages the context shows that Italian towns are meant; in one case (*Tac. Ann.* III. 55), where this very subject of adlection to the Senate is being dealt with, there is no mention of Italy, but the phrase *coloniae et municipia* is used alone and in sharp contrast to *prouinciae*. 'Noui homines e municipiis et coloniis atque etiam prouinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti.' That the phrase here is equivalent to *Italia* is made

<sup>1</sup> There are two pages numbered 133 in the book, which is really two books bound together. My reference is to the second page 133.

practically certain by the parallel passage of Suetonius (*Vesp.* 9) 'honestissimo quoque *Italicorum* ac prouincialium alleto.'

That Claudius, in spite of his 'ubique,' used the words in the same sense, of towns in Italy, is to my mind abundantly proved by his very next sentence. 'Quid ergo? non *Italicus* senator prouinciali potior est?' Claudius here turns to answer an anticipated objection. The objection clearly is that these senators encouraged by Augustus and Tiberius were Italians, and are no precedent for the admission of provincials. Freely paraphrased the sentence means, 'But those were Italians, whereas you are proposing to bring in provincials, a very different thing.'

On Dr. Hardy's theory this mention of Italian senators is not easy to explain. According to him the distinction now at issue is not that between Italian senators and provincial senators, but that between members of *municipia* in the provinces, who have hitherto been admitted to the senate, and non-members, whom Claudius now proposes to admit. Why should Italy be dragged into a discussion which only concerns two classes of residents in the provinces?

I do not think, then, that *coloniae et municipia* in the speech of Claudius can mean towns in the provinces. If it does not, then the one argument in favour of Dr. Hardy's theory perishes, and we should do well to return to the view of Professor Pelham, to which I can see no serious objection.

H. J. CUNNINGHAM.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

practical  
quoque

The  
of towns  
'Quid e  
to ans  
senator  
precede  
means,  
provinc

Or  
explain  
Italian  
in the  
membe  
dragge  
provinc

I c  
can me  
favour  
view o

W

## CLAVDIVS AND THE PRIMORES GALLIAE.

THIS old difficulty has recently received a new explanation from the pen of Dr. E. G. Hardy (*Roman Laws and Charters*, pp. 133<sup>1</sup> sqq.). Dr. Hardy believes—and his view has met with some acceptance—that the disability, under which these Gallic candidates for admission to the Senate laboured, was the want of a *municipalis origo*. Up to this time, he contends, only Romans who were members of a town of Roman or Latin rights were eligible for admission to the Senate. Now in the Tres Galliae there were practically no such towns: these Gallic chiefs possessed the *civitas* individually by special grant and not as members of any municipality. Hence the door of the curia was closed to them while it was open to Romans from Lugdunum or Vienna.

I venture to think that this explanation is quite untenable. Several general considerations might be urged against it, but, what is more important, the one piece of evidence which Dr. Hardy can produce in support of it gives it, in my opinion, no support whatever. It is the following passage from the speech of Claudius (col. ii.):

Sane nouo m[ore] et diuus Aug[ustus au]junc[ulus m]eus et patruus Ti. Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum et municipiorum, bonorum scilicet hominum et locupletium, in hac curia esse uoluit. Quid ergo? Non Italicus senator prouinciali potior est? . . . Sed ne prouinciales quidem, si modo ornare curiam poterunt, reiciendos puto.

Dr. Hardy giving *ubique* its full force translates 'throughout the Empire,' and apparently thinks that the colonies and *municipia* alluded to are those in the provinces. But the phrase 'coloniae et municipia' is constantly used of Italian towns, and so comes to be an equivalent for 'Italy' (e.g. Lex Agraria 31, Sallust *Cat.* 17 and 58, *De Bello Gallico* VIII. 50, Mon. Anc. 21). The use is specially frequent in Tacitus (*Ann.* I. 79, III. 55, IV. 67, XV. 33, *Hist.* II. 20, 56, 62). In most of these passages the context shows that Italian towns are meant; in one case (*Tac. Ann.* III. 55), where this very subject of adlection to the Senate is being dealt with, there is no mention of Italy, but the phrase *coloniae et municipia* is used alone and in sharp contrast to *prouinciae*. 'Noui homines e municipiis et coloniis atque etiam prouinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti.' That the phrase here is equivalent to *Italia* is made

<sup>1</sup> There are two pages numbered 133 in the book, which is really two books bound together.

practically certain by the parallel passage of Suetonius (*Vesp.* 9) 'honestissimo quoque *Italicorum* ac prouincialium alleto.'

That Claudius, in spite of his 'ubique,' used the words in the same sense, of towns in Italy, is to my mind abundantly proved by his very next sentence. 'Quid ergo? non *Italicus* senator prouinciali potior est?' Claudius here turns to answer an anticipated objection. The objection clearly is that these senators encouraged by Augustus and Tiberius were Italians, and are no precedent for the admission of provincials. Freely paraphrased the sentence means, 'But those were Italians, whereas you are proposing to bring in provincials, a very different thing.'

On Dr. Hardy's theory this mention of Italian senators is not easy to explain. According to him the distinction now at issue is not that between Italian senators and provincial senators, but that between members of *municipia* in the provinces, who have hitherto been admitted to the senate, and non-members, whom Claudius now proposes to admit. Why should Italy be dragged into a discussion which only concerns two classes of residents in the provinces?

I do not think, then, that *coloniae et municipia* in the speech of Claudius can mean towns in the provinces. If it does not, then the one argument in favour of Dr. Hardy's theory perishes, and we should do well to return to the view of Professor Pelham, to which I can see no serious objection.

H. J. CUNNINGHAM.

WORCESTER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** Vol. 34. No. 4.

A. C. Johnson, *The Creation of the Tribe Ptolemais at Athens*. A full chronological and historical discussion, as a result of which the establishment of this new Athenian tribe is assigned to 232/1 B.C. instead of 224/3, the date usually adopted. In the inscription I. G. II. 384 (of the same year as II. 5. 385b) the king whose name is erased is Antigonus, not Attalus, and it is to be assigned to 242/1. The dates of the archons between 262/1 and 232/1, which are all affected by the new date of the foundation of Ptolemais, are discussed and tabulated. E. B. Lease, *Neve and neque with the Imperative and Subjunctive*. Conclusion of the statistical paper begun in the previous number. W. S. Fox, *Mummy Labels in the Royal Ontario Museum*. Transcription with facsimiles of nine labels with explanatory and grammatical comments. T. L. Shear, *Inscriptions from Loryma and Vicinity*. Nine Greek inscriptions with epigraphical comments.

**Athenaeum** (Pavia). Vol. II., Part I. 1914.

C. Lanzani, *Principii di religione Dionisiaca*. Quotes from Homer and Herodotus and passes in review the theories of a Thracian and a Phrygian-Asiatic origin of Dionysus, his late admittance into Greece, and traces of his identity with other oriental deities (e.g. Indian Soma, Sabazius, etc.), but is mainly concerned in showing him to have been in later times a solar god in his earthly manifestations (Dendrites; Sykypes; Phytalmios, etc.) paralleled by Apollo the solar deity of the heavens, and by Orpheus the sun-god as man. C. Pascal discusses the first ten lines of the Aeneid in the light of an interesting mosaic discovered in 1896 at Susa in Tunis, which is said to be almost contemporaneous with Virgil and represents the poet as seated between two Muses, and holding a scroll containing the eighth line of the Aeneid. P. easily refutes the view of Jean Martin that the previous seven lines of the poem should be regarded as spurious, pointing out that the presence of the Muses in the picture is the reason for the choice of the line.

V. Costanzi adds a further note on *Zeus Thaulios*, demurring to the correction by H. v. Gärtringen of Θαῦλος in Hesychius into Θαύλιος, and distinguishing the two words; the form in -ος being adjectival, derived from the original Θαῦλος (Maced. Δαυλος), a wolf-god. C. Pascal interprets the adjective *paeonius* (in Ovid *Met.* xv. 533-5 and Virgil *Aen.* vii. 769) as having some reference to a special herb called variously *pentrobon aglaophotis* and *glycysides* (see Apuleius *De medicam. herb.* C. 66, and Pliny, *N. H.* xxvii. 10).

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.**

1913. Nov. 29. E. Engström, *Carmina latina epigraphica post editam collectionem Buechlerianam in lucem prolata conlegit* E. E. (Hosius). Some 450 poetical inscriptions. A. J. B. Wace and M. S. Thompson, *Prehistoric Thessaly* (Goessler).

Dec. 6. Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Kranken-Anstalten im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (Schonack). A sketch with references to sources. A. Furtwängler, *Kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von J. Sieveking und L. Curtius (Sauer). Well edited, many excellent illustrations.

Dec. 13. E. Belzner, *Homerische Probleme*. I. *Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der Odyssee als kritische Instanz*. II. *Die Komposition der Odyssee* (Cauer). In I the chapter 'Kulturstufen' in Cauer's 'Grundfragen der Homerkritik' is criticized. C. here replies at length. In II he praises, with some reserve, ch. 3 'Die Baukunst des Dichters.' W. M. Lindsay, *Early Welsh Script* (Weinberger). The MSS of which facsimiles are given are specially interesting. *Festschrift zur 51. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* (Tolkiehn). Includes a paper by R. Methner on Horace. E. Schwartz, *Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche* (Bauer). Lectures. L. Laurand in an interesting note points out that the frequency of the epistolary use of the tenses is exaggerated in many grammars, e.g. Riemann, § 148, 'toutes les fois.' The fact is that a Roman may adapt the tense to the point of view of the recipient, but he is perfectly free. In most of Cicero's letters no such shift is found.

Dec. 20. A. Klotz, *P. Papini Stati Silvae*, it. ed. A. K. (Helm). Better than the first edition, but not satisfactory. Δ. Κ. Τοποτός, Γῆ καὶ Γεωργοὶ τῆς Θεσσαλίας κατὰ τὴν Τουρκοκρατίαν ἐπὶ τῷ βάσει ἱστορικῶν πηγῶν (Stählin). The German consul at Volo shows that the land system in Thessaly (large landlords and δουλοπάρουκοι, serfs attached to the soil) was not introduced by the Turks, but was a continuation of the ancient system and is a natural result of the climatic conditions.

Dec. 27. R. Reitzenstein, *Zur Sprache der lateinischen Erotik* (Bürger). A short paper (36 pp., Winter, Heidelberg), but important for the light that it throws on Catullus. *The John Rylands Library. Brief Description, with Catalogue of a Selection of MSS. etc.* (Weinberger). Very welcome; a complete list of the MSS is very desirable. E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Weinberger). Very valuable for the study of the development of Greek or Latin writing. H. Stuart Jones, *The Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino* (Schröder). Praised.

1914. Jan. 3. C. Robert, *Die Spürhunde von Sophokles, frei übersetzt und ergänzt* (Bucherer). Second edition, with illustrations showing how the play was performed in Germany. L. Castiglioni, *Osservazione critiche e grammaticali a Curzio Rufo* (Stangl). J. Schlageter, *Der Wortschatz der ausserhalb Attikas gefundenen attischen Inschriften* (Cröner). Useful. Good index.

Jan. 10. F. Fischer, *Thucydidis reliquiae in papyris et membranis Aegyptiacis servatae*. Collegit F. F. (Hude). J. C. Vollgraff, *Platonis dialogus qui inscribitur Phaedrus, rec. J. C. V. (Ritter)*. The edition is useful, because it includes a copy of the Bodleian MS., but is otherwise unsatisfactory. W. S. Teuffel, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Vol. 3, 579 pp. (from Nerva to Charlemagne) (Hosius). The sixth edition of this excellent reference book is edited by W. Kroll and F. Skutsch. Many of the articles on the poets are by Skutsch. The Christian writers are more fully treated than before.

Jan. 17. H. W. Garrod, *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse* (Helm). Praised. The Introduction interesting. G.'s text of the *Pervigilium* is preferable to Mackail's. F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Vol. 1, *Die archaische Literatur*, 496 pp. (Klotz). A history of literature for continuous reading, not a reference book like the valuable works of Teuffel or of Schanz in which the material for such a history is collected. It brings out clearly the connexion of Roman literature with Greek literature and philosophy and, in general, with the life of the time.

Jan. 24. W. Kroll, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Orator*, erkl. von W. K. (Stroux). The reviewer draws attention to some faults, but thinks that K. has contributed much to the understanding of the work. The notes on Cicero's language are specially good. K. v. Holzinger, *Die Aristophaneshandschriften der Wiener Hofbibliothek* (Rabe). The twelve MSS treated in great detail. W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (Swoboda). Much praised. R. Dietrich, *Collectanea zu Artemidorus Daldianus* (Cröner). Indispensable for the thorough study of A. Published (1911-13) in 7 parts.

Jan. 31. T. Rice Holmes, *Cäsars Feldzüge in Gallien und Britannien* (Klotz). This abridged translation will make the results of H.'s important work known to a wider circle, but for more serious study the English originals will be indispensable. N. Wecklein, *Ausf. Kommentar zu Sophokles' Philoktet* (H. F. Müller). Aims at giving the teacher all that he needs.

Feb. 7. A. Siedow, *De elisionis aphaeresis hiatus usu in hexametris Latinis ab Enni usque ad Ovidii tempora* (Bickel). Gives useful statistics.

Feb. 14. Schneidewin—Nauck, *Sophokles, Elektra*, erkl. von S.-N. (Bucherer). Tenth edition recast by E. Bruhn. The Introduction new. The notes specially good. B. has published as the eighth volume to the Weidmann Sophocles an 'Anhang' on the diction of Tragedy. By reference to this the notes are lightened and room is found to go thoroughly into difficulties. I. Stroux, *De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi* (Mutschmann). Throws fresh light not only on Th. but in general on ancient rhetoric. C. Halm, *P. Cornelii Taciti libri*, rec. C. H.; Ed. V cur. G. Andresen. I. [The Annals] (Stangl). Text and app. crit. very good. Index historicus 53 pp.

Feb. 21. O. Gilbert, *Griechische Religionsphilosophie* (Lortzing). The reviewer discusses this book (publ. 1911) at great length. While disagreeing for the most part from the author's views, he praises the work in many ways, especially the treatment of Anaxagoras, the earlier Stoicism, and Aristotle. H. Uhle, *Griechisches Vokabular in etymologischer Ordnung* (Bernhard). Seeks to aid the student in acquiring a vocabulary.

Feb. 28. R. Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Capelle). Discusses the book (which appeared several years ago) in considerable detail. J. Brix, *Plautus, Menaechmi*, erkl. v. J. B. (Köhlm). Fifth edition, revised by M. Niemeyer. Many improvements, though not wholly satisfactory. *Roman Farm Management. The treatises of Cato and Varro done into English . . . by a Virginia farmer* (Becher). Warmly praised.

March 7. A. Rosenberg, *Der Staat der alten Italiker* (Soltau). Throws new light on the development of the Roman constitution. Specially interesting is the comparison of Rome and Latium with the rest of Italy. The reviewer sketches the contents. Th. Stangl contributes to this number an interesting paper: *Wie alt ist die unchronologische handschriftliche Reihenfolge der oratorischen Bücher Ciceros?*

#### Classical Weekly (New York). 1913.

Dec. 6. M. N. Tod, *International Arbitration amongst the Greeks* (W. L. Westermann). 'This essay is a thorough piece of scholarly work, well organised and attractively written.'

Dec. 20. M. W. Humphreys, *Demosthenes on the Crown* (C. F. Smith). The teacher as well as the pupil will learn much from the notes about Greek usage.

1914. Jan. 10. J. E. Harrison, *Themis* (J. W. Hewitt). 'The excursus on the ritual forms preserved in Greek tragedy . . . by Gilbert Murray is in my opinion the most valuable portion of the volume.' 'Miss Harrison's own work is stimulating and extremely (no weaker word will do) original.' 'The volume is "interesting but not conclusive," a stimulating companion, but a dangerous guide.'

Jan. 24. (1) H. Hirt, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. (2) K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*. Vierte vermehrte Auflage, bearbeitet von A. Thumb (Sturtevant). 'Hirt is readable and suggestive, and, in the main, a safe book to put in the hands of a beginner.' 'If one wants to find out what is known about any given topic of Greek grammar he will turn first to Brugmann-Thumb.' W. S. Ferguson, *Greek Imperialism* (A. C. Johnson). F.'s 'researches in the documents of Hellenistic Athens have restored order out of chaos.' In these, his Lowell, Lectures 'he maintains the thesis that the age of Pericles was but the youthful bloom of the science of government. The vigorous maturity came in the days of Macedonian supremacy.'

Feb. 7. Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (W. A. Heidel). 'The latter half of the book rests in the main upon solid foundations, whereas the former half consists for the most part of a tissue of speculations and hypotheses which cannot be verified.' 'There is very much which deserves hearty commendation—far more than calls for protest and criticism.'

Feb. 21. E. A. Sonnenschein, *The Unity of the Latin Subjunctive* (C. E. Bennett). 'If obligation was the basal meaning of the subjunctive and optative in Indo-European, why is it that clear instances of the usage do not abound on every hand?' F. M. Cornford, *From Religion to Philosophy* (J. W. Hewitt). 'A fresh and stimulating book, but one which the reader instinctively adorns with marginal interrogation marks.'

### Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1913.

Dec. 13. E. Stemplinger, *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur* (W. Crönert). Superficial. C. H. Beeson, *Isidor-Studien* (W. M. Lindsay). Discusses the diffusion of MSS. of Isidore throughout Europe, and gives a critical edition of the *Tituli*, verses in which he shows Isidore to have depended much on Martial. A. B. Drachmann, *Diodorus' römische Annalen bis 302 a. Chr.*, ed. A. B. D. (O. Leuze). A convenient collection with an improved text.

Dec. 20. W. Petersen, *The Greek Diminutive-Suffix -ισκο, -ισκη* (H. Meltzer). An attractive treatment of a difficult subject. C. Bardt, *Römische Charakterköpfe in Briefen vornehmlich aus cäsarischer und trajanischer Zeit* (J. Ziehen). Contains about eighty letters of Cicero and fifty of Pliny, tastefully translated, and with interesting comparisons from modern history.

1914. Jan. 10. A. Hausrath and A. Marx, *Griechische Märchen* (O. Weinreich). A charming collection of tales from Greek and Latin authors. E. W. Bowen, *The Annals of Tacitus*, Books I., II. (E. Wolff). The editor makes good use of the best authorities.

Jan. 17. S. Kriegbaum, *Der Ursprung der von Kallikles in Platon's Gorgias vertretenen Anschauungen* (B. von Hagen). Shows that the thoughts expressed by Kallikles were at the time widely diffused. A. Hillebrandt, *Lieder des Rigveda*, übers. von A. H. (L. von Schroeder). A selection containing about one-eighth of the hymns. R. Ganschienietz, *Hippolytos' Kapitel gegen die Magier* (A. Abt).

Jan. 31. J. Rasch, *Sophocles quid debeat Herodoto* (W. Aly).

Feb. 7. H. Slonimsky, *Heraklit und Parmenides* (W. Nestle). Deals chiefly with the question of the relation of perception to thought. F. W. Westaway, *Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin* (A. Debrunner). Based on sound principles.

Feb. 14. W. Baege, *De Macedonum sacris* (O. Weinreich). The worship of Dionysos, Zeus, and Ammon is prominent.

Feb. 21. W. Gebhardi, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu den lyrischen Dichtungen des Horaz* (E. Stemplinger). Too wordy. M. W. Humphreys, *Demosthenes on the Crown*, ed. with introd. and notes by M. W. H. The strong point consists in the references to parallel passages in Greek and other literature. Th. Birt, *Römische Charakterköpfe* (W. von Dettingen). A striking picture of world-history in a series of portraits.

Feb. 28. K. Latte, *De saltationibus Graecorum capita quinque* (A. Abt). Treats the cult-dances as protective ceremonials, either to guard a sacred rite or to frighten off demons. H. Mutschmann, *Tendenz, Aufbau und Quellen der Schrift vom Erhabenen*. H. F. Müller, *Die Schrift über das Erhabene*: deutsch von H. F. M. (J. Stroux) Mutschmann shows that the anonymous author cannot be dependent on Caecilius, for he stands for genius and energy as against correctness and rule. In suggesting Theodoros of Gadera as source, M. is less happy. Müller would have done well in his translation to seek more help from Rhys Roberts.

**Hermes.** Vol. 49. Part 1. 1914.

P. Friedländer, *Das Proömium der Theogonie*. Ll. 36-115 form a typical and technically complete hymn to the Muses where any reference to himself on the part of the poet would have been out of place. Hence the personal reference (1-35) is made to precede. C. Robert, *Pandora*, an examination of the myth in the light of the Pandora krater in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. A. Adler, *Die Commentare des Asklepiades von Myrla*, argues (against Lehrs) that he is identical with the commentator on Pindar. U. Kahrstedt, *Staatsrechtliches zum Putsch von 411*. H. F. Müller, *Plotinische Studien II*, possible Oriental traits in P. P. Stengel, *Zu den griechischen Schwurpfern*, on τόμα and ἵερα τέλεια. J. Brause, ΤΟΡΤΥΝΙΩΝ ΟΡΚΟΣ ΝΟΜΙΜΟΣ. O. Lenze, *Aedilis lustralis*, argues that this is equivalent to *aedilis quinquennialis*. U. Wilcken, *Plinius' Reisen in Bithynien und Pontus*. K. Uhlemann, *Zu Aristoteles Eth. Nic. III. 1.* Th. Thalheim, *Zu Antiphon*, comments.

**MISCELLEN.** P. Wolters, 'Ακοαί in IG. iv. 955 l. 10, ordinary interpretation confirmed from *Life of Proklos* 32 p. 79. F. Leo, *Zu Satyros*, βίος Εἰρηπίδον, Hunt's Fragment 9 of *Ox. Pap.* 1176 is a quotation from *Odyssey* 463-6. A. Schulten conjectures ἥδη ὁ πορθμός for ἥδιοροδαος in Herodorus F. H. G. ii. 34. A. Stein, Heron's "Opoi to be dated by address to Διονίσιος λαμπτότατε, who is probably the prefect of Egypt in 188. F. Petersen points out that in Flinders Petrie, *Pap.* vol. ii. p. 160 the fragment numbered xlix C is Fr. 22 and part of 60 of the *Hypsipyle*. C. Robert, *Ein verkanntes Ciris-Bild*, identifies a figure from the Domus aurea with Ciris.

**Mnemosyne.** 42. I.

J. J. Hartmann, *Ad Plutarchi moralia annotationes criticae (cont.)*. On *An Virtus doceri possit: De virtute morali*: neither work is Plutarch's. Notes on text. K. Sneyders de Vogel, *De Verbis pronominalibus*. Takes pronominal uses, especially reflexive, found in Romance Languages and traces their development from Classical Latin through Late Latin. M. Boas, *De librorum Calonianorum historia atque compositione*. Exhaustive survey of MSS. Traces the growth of the collection from a combination of Cato and Avianus in the ninth and tenth century. M. Valeton, *De Iliadis Compositione (cont.)*. Many poets had sung of the tale of Troy: then came a great poet, the author of the *Mήνις*, and made this the central point of a great epic. The *Wrath of Achilles* is the dramatic moment of the poem, and makes it epic and no longer only saga. The author of the *Mήνις* or *Achilleis* is no diaskeuast but a creative poet. He uses older material. The *Patrocleia* is no integral part of the *Achilleis*. Achilles was not brought to fight by love, but yielded to the repentance of Agamemnon and the danger of the Greeks. Valeton then seeks to define the scope of the *Achilleis* more closely. The whole of Π-Ω is not part of it except the μήνιδος ἀπόρρησις (to be continued). W. Wollgraff, *Ad Sofoclis Indagatores*. Restorations and emendations to the text: discussion of the τριζύγης οἴμον βάσιν. P. H. Damsté, *Ad A. Gellium*. Notes on text. I. H. Leopold, *De leone Delphico Croesi dono*. Reconstruction from dimensions in Hdt. I. 50. A. Slijpen, *Flavi Iosephi locus qui est de Iesu Christo*. Arguments for genuineness of the passage from the history of MS. tradition, and the lack of a motive for interpolation: interpretation of the words themselves. Ch. Ch. Charitonides, χρῆμα-χρήματα apud Herodotum. Examination of use in Hdt. shows Pollux to be wrong in his generalisation (ix. 87) about the Ionic use of the word. M. R. J. Brinkgreve, *De locis nonnullis Statianis*. Notes on text.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum**, etc. XXXIII. 1. 1914.

H. Diels, *Wissenschaft und Technik bei den Hellenen*. Applications of science to art and affairs, from Thales to Archimedes. W. Schick, *Zwei römische Kolossalstatuen und die hellenistische Kunst Syriens* (with plates). From the colossal bronze of a naked

prince in the Terme at Rome (Helbig, *Führer* II<sup>2</sup> No. 114), which he takes for Seleukos IV or, better, his son Demetrios I, and from the colossal gilt-bronze Hercules in the Palazzo dei Conservatori (Helbig, *Führer*<sup>3</sup> No. 1005), and its like, S. infers a Syrophenician school in the second century B.C. The history of Græco-syrian sculpture is sketched; and the influence and meaning of the long-backed and round-shouldered pose of the Apoxyomenos are discussed. F. Dibelius, *Zur Geschichte der blauen Grotte auf Capri*. Its discovery, and reasons for connecting it with Tiberius. J. I., *Ein Brief Friedrich Ritschls*: in praise of Ribbeck (1858).

## XXXIII. 2.

E. Löwy, *Zur Aithiopis* (with plates). With the help of the kylikes of Pamphaios in the B.M. and of Duris in the Louvre, L. infers how the end of Memnon must have been told in the *Aithiopis*; whence the *Iliad* must have drawn its odd tale of the end of Sarpedon (II 431 sqq.). Other debts of our Homer to the *Aith.*, and the date of the *Aith.*, are discussed. B. Warnecke, *Die bürgerliche Stellung der Schauspieler im alten Rom*. The evidence is reviewed. Incidentally, the existence of collegia of players in the third century B.C. is denied. A. Bauer, *Hippolytos von Rom*.

## Philologus. LXXII. Heft 3. 1913.

A. Müller, *Die Schimpfwörter in der griechischen Komödie*. A collection and discussion of the various terms. H. F. Müller, *Plotinus über die Vorsehung*. An enthusiastic vindication of Plotinus. His philosophy is essentially Hellenic. W. Soltau, *Classis und Classes in Rom*. Contends for the military, not timocratic, origin of the classes and centuriae. O. Könnecke, *Zu Theokrit*. Discusses Theocr. 7. 95 sqq., 10. 18, and 22. W. Gurlitt, *De hiatu in Dionysii Halicarnassensis De Antiquitatibus Romanis libris obvio*. (1) Statistics for hiatus; (2) Emendations of text. F. Lamert, *De C. Julii Solini Collectaneis a Guidone de Bazochius adhibitis*. Gives particulars about Guido de B., who died 1203, and illustrates his borrowing from Solinus. Th. O. H. Achelis, *De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum I*. A very full statement of the case for attributing ἴποθέσεις to Aristophanes. Part I. discusses the quotation from the *Eym. Genuinum*, etc., and gives an account of the extant ἴποθέσεις. A. Müller, *Der Schauplatz in Aristophanes' Wespen V. 1123 ff.* Argues (against Wilamowitz) that the scene took place in the open. S. Eitrem, *Die Hera mit der Schere*. This Hera is not ὄμφαλητόμος, as generally stated. Iron was very rarely used for this purpose, owing to superstitious dread (cf. Soran, *Gyn.* 80). Rather she represents the bride whose hair was cut short. H. Blümner, "Ἄλες". Shows that the metaphorical meaning of ἄλες = wit (Lat. *sales*), does not occur earlier than Plut. *Comp. Aristoph. et Menand.* 4 p. 854 c. In earlier passages, generally quoted, the word has a different sense.

## LXXII. Heft 4. 1914.

P. Maas, *Verschiedenes*. (1) Strabo excerpts contained in Psellus; (2) Hesychius, father of Synesius; (3) Suggestions in Krumbacher's Moscow collection of proverbs, Theocritus (15. 8 read Δίος for τῆνος), Simmias, Alciphron, Aristophanes, Pindar. P. Corssen, *Die epischen Gedichte des Euphorion*. Criticisms of Suidas' notice: χιλίων ἐπῶν suggested for χιλίων ἑτῶν, Γῆς Περίοδος for Ἡσίωδος. In *Berliner Klassiker-texte* V. 273. 2 proposes λωτέρης for νωτέρης. K. Svoboda, *Die Abfassungszeit des Geschichtswerkes des Polybios*. 1-XXXI 21 were written down before 146 B.C. Publication began at end of Polybius' confinement at Rome, but only I-IV or V were then published. The work was resumed some time after 146, and finally brought to an end. G. A. Gerhard, *Der Prolog des Persius*. In this Choliambic piece Persius appears as the imitator of Hellenistic satire, not yet as the Roman satirist. A. Müller, *Die Schimpfwörter in der römischen Komödie*. The words collected and discussed. P. Lehmann, *Cassiodorstudien*. (iii.) A correction of Manitius;

(iv.) Isidore's dependence on Cassiodorus, illustrated by parallel passages. Th. O. H. Achelis, *De Aristophanis Byzantii argumentis fabularum II.* The *ἰποθέσεις* carefully analysed and compared. Here σκηνή, χορός, πρόλογος and διδασκαλικά are dealt with. O. Weinreich, *Ein Gedicht des Aristoteles.* Defends gen. φιλίης frag. Arist. 673. R. E. von Stern, *Graffiti.* Inscriptions scratched on vases. A. Sonny, *Zur Moskauer Sammlung mittelgriechischer Sprichwörter.* Some further corrections. K. Preisdanz, *Die Homeromantie Pap. Lond. CXXI.* An arrangement of the fragments.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. XXXVII. No. 1. 1913.

L. Havet, Notes on the text of the Lives of Virgil (Donatus lines 286 sqq. Brummer, l. *praestauit* for *praestruit*) and Phocas 74, Hor. *Carm.* 1. 7. 23 (proposes *populna*) 28. 19 (omit *et* or *ac*) *Epid.* 2. 15, 16 (place before 11) 5. 55 (argues for *dum*), 15. 7, 17. 39, 16. 61-62 and 49, 50 (two alternative couplets from different editions of the epodes), *Carm. Saec.* 26 supports Bentley's *dictum stabilis per acuum* by diplomatic considerations. P. Collomp, *A source of Clement of Alexandria and the pseudo-Clementine Homilies.* The excerpta *ex Theodoto* and the *Elogiae Propheticae* which follow the *Stromateis* of C. are seemingly extracts from a work frequently used for the *Strom.*; and the *Homilies* have drawn from this or a kindred source. J. Marouzeau, *The Value of the MSS of Seneca's Dialogues.* Protests against the unique importance assigned by recent editors to the Milan MS. A. P. Fabia, *The Embassy of Otho to the Vitellians.* Analysis of the account in Tac. *Hist.* 1. 74. A. Diès, *Platonica*, conjectures on *Theaetetus* 166a-168b and *Symposium* 186a-188e. L. Bayard, note on a Christian inscription and passages of S. Cyprian. C. Picard, *Inscriptions of the Theatre at Ephesus and the worship of the Ephesian Artemis.* Utilises the epigraphical material published by the Austrian Mission, *Forschungen in Ephesos* vol. 2. A. Bourgery, *Notes on the text of Seneca.* Mostly in defence of the MS. tradition. B. Haussoullier, corrections in inscriptions of Selymbria, B.C.H. xxxvi. 1912, Nos. 9-11.

No. 2.

P. Préchac argues at length that the Epicurean of Cic. *Fam.* VII. 12. 1 (addressed to Trebatius) is Velleius (MSS. *Zetius*). L. Havet, the sign *l* or *l.* in the archetype of Varro's *Res Rust.* is a corruption of *Z* (= *ζῆται*) affixed to obscure passages. P. Collart, *Nonnus as epigrammatist.* A collection of passages (e.g. XVII. 74-80) from his epic poem which show this quality. The same. *Anth. Pal.* 9. 198. 2 is an imitative allusion to the *Dionysiaca* (cf. id. 29. 273. 5. 2 etc.). L. Delaruelle, *On Livy's mode of writing history:* a sceptical analysis of IV. 17-19 (the episode of Cossus). P. Vallette, *Phoenix of Colophon and the 'Cynic' poetry.* His choliambics show 'Cynic' influence, that is all. D. Serruys gives reasons for thinking that Phoenix and the pseudo-Heraclitus belonged to a sect of Cynics which had qualified the doctrines of Diogenes by an admixture of those of Heraclitus. A. Diès, discussion of textual difficulties in the *'Ελένης ἐγκώμιον* of Gorgias.

No. 3.

Ch. Joret, *The Lappa in Pliny and its equivalents in Theophrastus and Dioscorides.* *Lappa* is not the *Galium Aparine* of Linnaeus; but the *Arctium Lappa* or the burdock. J. E. Harry, conjecture on Eur. *I. A.* 1193. L. Havet, Tib. I. 10. 11 for *uulgi* read *Valgi* [Heyne's conjecture]. R. Pichon, on the *Atellanae.* In Livy VII. 4 the words '*conserta fabellis Atellanis potissimum*' mean 'constructed by the help of stories chiefly those of Atella.' The same, *Critical Notes on the de uita beata.* On 4. 4 (as A), 7. 1 read '*iniucunda sed honesta,*' 13. 2, 3 read '*itaque non quod dicunt plerique — infamis est 'at immerito,'*' etc. T. Walek, *An unpublished Delphian inscription.* Treaty of alliance between the Aetolians and Boeotians, assigned to B.C. 292.

## No. 4.

W. H. Buckler, *Monuments of Thyatira*. A collection of twenty-one Greek inscriptions, with facsimiles and elucidations. P. Roussel, *Sale of Civic Franchise*. A note on the first inscription in vol. 2 of the *Forschungen in Ephesos* which has been misunderstood. It gives the conditions under which the full franchise might be obtained from the State for a sum of six minae.

*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*. XLIX. 1. Festschrift for J. M. Stahl.

O. Seeck, *Die Reichspräfektur des vierten Jahrhunderts*. The office is a college of two praefects. Osiris and Typhos in Synesius' *Αἰγύπτιοι λόγοι* are Aurelian and Caesarius. Valuable discussion of historical authority of the Codex Theodos. Chronology of Praefects from 379 to 387 A.D.: development and powers of the office since Diocletian. F. Philippi, *Zur Peutingerischen Tafel*. The Road-system of the Empire comes from the times of Hadrian: other geographical detail is due mainly to retouching; apparently we have a handy publication made from a monumental edition displayed on the wall of some public building: relation of the tabula to the *Geographus Ravennas*, etc. P. Cauer, *Der Verlauf der Kampfszenen in M und O*. Critical analysis: determination of points in common between the two books, and signs of adaptation to them elsewhere in the *Iliad*. The other parts which deal with the Three Days' Fighting are older than the *Fight at the Wall*, and yet show references to it: their relation with M is not so organic as that of O with M. P. E. Sonnenburg, *De Menandri Heroe*: to clear up the plot. L. Radermacher, *Prodikos bei Aristophanes*. Suggests tentatively that the verbal nicety attributed to Euripides in the *Frogs* is supposed to be learnt from Prodicus of Ceos. W. Kroll, *Randbemerkungen* (continued). XXI.-XXVII. on points of Latin idiom, criticisms on Baehren's articles, *Mnem.* 38. 395 sqq., *Philol. Suppl.* 12. 235 sqq., on ἀτὸς κοινῶν constructions, etc. C. Hosius, *Zur italienischen Überlieferung des Lucrez*. F comes from (X) but has been emended by a good scholar; it makes it possible to control independent mistakes by L and provides ingenious and valuable conjectures. UV have some slight independent value. R. Wünsch, *Anmerkungen zur lateinischen Syntax*. Notes on history or origin of phrases; on genitive of apposition, construction of *in video*, on *quod promisi institutum* etc. in *Cato Agri cult.*, pp. 11, 16. H. Winnefeld, *Zur Geschichte des syrischen Heliopolis*. Traces the history of the town mainly from coins and inscriptions. F. Koepf, *Das Gemälde der Schlacht bei Oinoe in der Stoa Poikile zu Athen*. On the historical pictures at Athens: the battle of Oenoë is to be dated about 456 B.C. K. Münscher, *Zu Sophokles Ichneutai*. Suggestions on the text: reconstruction of the action: the date probably between 468 and 458 B.C., as there is no clear sign of a third actor. E. Schweikert, *Strittige Interpunktions in den Gedichten des Horaz*. Uses interrogation to explain certain difficult passages. So in C. III. 23 read question after *mica*, taking *hostia* as abl. of comparison, *favre et mica* as abl. of instrum. K. Witte, *Der Hexameter des Ennius*. Discusses the hexameter of Ennius as compared with Homer. Ennius' main practice is to have strong caesuras in the first half of the verse, weak in the second. This is in part due to the influence of the national verse, the Saturnian. Much good criticism of current generalisations on the historical development of the Greek and Latin Hexameter. W. Schwering, *De Ovidio et Menandro*. Notes on the form of the phrase in Plaut. *Poen.* 337-8 with parallels. In Ovid. *Ars Am.* I. 99 there is apparently an echo not of Plautus but of Menander, who is Plautus' source for the scene in question. Ovid's phrase is imitated by later writers. O. Hoffmann, *Das dorische ā im Trimeter der attischen Tragödie*. This is not explained adequately either by a borrowing from the chorus or by metrical convenience. The 'Rezitationsvers' must come from an Ionic form already partly Doricised before Tragedy began, viz., the Doric Satyr-play. The development to tragedy proper was made at Corinth and so the Dorian admixture precedes the origin of Tragedy in Attica. A. Elter, *Zu Andokides*, *Myst.* 68. Ando-

cides' family tree shows that here ἀνεψιδεῖς should be read for ἀνεψιοὶ τρεῖς. A. Brinkmann, *Zu Dionysius Brief an Pompeius und Demetrius πέρι ἐρμηνείας*. In Dion, p. 237: 1, 232. 5, there is a gap in the archetype. In p. 226: 5, 238, 7, the text is defended. In p. 238: 15 sqq., there is no reason to athetise the repeated words; in 246: 16 sqq., read δοκεῖ ὡς ὁ μυθενόμενος εἶναι . . . ἀκριβῆς εἶναι ὡς . . . ; in Demetr. § 58, read τοῖς τὸ καὶ τὸ οὐδὲν πρὸς ἔπος λέγουσιν; in § 188 instances are given to support the conjecture λεπταῖς.

**Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione Classica.** Vol. 42. No. 4. 1914.

A. Beltrami, *A new manuscript of the Moral Epistles of Seneca*. The writer continues his account of the *Codex Quirinianus* hymn in the last *Rivista*. He distinguishes the various hands and examines its relations to the other MSS. used by Hense in the Teubner edition. Of these the Laurentianus (L), which is about half a century earlier, is nearest to it. The Venetus (V) is closely allied to both, and also the Metensis (M), which is adduced as a corroborator of M. While Q agrees for the most part with the better MSS., it has on the other hand agreements, in good readings, with inferior MSS. and anticipates corrections of modern scholars (Erasmus, Madvig, etc.). Examples are given from *Epp.* 1-88. V. Ussani, *Fresh Gleanings from Horace. Tyndaris*, the name of the *citharistria* of *Carm.* I. 17 (traditionally identified with Canidia or Gratidia) may have been suggested by the Τευδαρέου γαμβρός of Cercidas (*Mel.* II. 13) in a passage which bears a striking resemblance to Horace S. I. ii. 125 sqq. S. I. 4. 35: some support for 'non non cuiquam' is derived from a scholium of the pseud Acron. which is emended. S. II. 2. 42: he proposes *tum* for *cum* on the ground that *quando* is always temporal in Horace. S. II. 3. 51: would read *vāris* for *variis*. L. Pareti, *The Derivation of Rhegium in Strabo* (VI. 1. 6 p. 258c) and the Samnite element in Brutium. An array of lexicological and historical arguments demonstrating that Pais' views on this passage are untenable. The Greek means that Strabo does not determine whether the city's name *Rhegium* is derived from the breaking (*ρήγνιναι*) of the Isthmus or from the Latin word corresponding to the Greek *βασιλεὺς*, the Samnites using a Latin word because their ancestors (*ἀρχηγέται*, i.e. the *Sabini*) were members of the Roman community and used Latin to a great extent (*ἐπὶ πολύ*, or 'over a considerable extent of territory'). O. Nazari derives *fenestra* from the root of -fendo as an opening 'knocked out of a wall'; and connects *glōria*, whose double sense of 'glory' and 'boasting' is illustrated by *κῦδος, κύδιστος*, with *gli-sco*, so that it would be for *glo-sia* (*gloeria*). M. Lenstrantin de Gubernates communicates a Latin inscription to one Erotiane. F. Pfister discusses the relations of the MSS. of the *Vita Alexandri Magni* with reference to F. Stabile's previous paper in the *Rivista*. A. Gandiglio proposes to understand 'oculis—inunctis' Hor. S. I. 3. 25 as 'unsalved eyes.' An appendix gives an account of some recent classical publications written in Russian.

**Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.** 1913.

Dec. 1. *Dikaiomata*, Auszüge aus alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle, herausg. von der Graeca Halensis (F. Zucker) I. R. Marquart, *Die Datierung des Euripideischen Kyklops* (K. Busche). Dates it 412 with *Andromeda* and *Helena*. E. Fölzer, *Die Bilderschlüsse der ostgallischen Sigillata-Manufakturen* (Ph. Fabia).

Dec. 8. B. Maurenbrecher and R. Wagner, *Grundzüge der klassischen Philologie*, III. 1. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 1 Hälfte. *Die Literatur der klassischen Zeit*, von R. Wagner (J. Sitzler). 'There is too much reference to other works for information that should be given here.' A. E. Zimmern, *The Greek Commonwealth. Politics and Economics in fifth-century Athens* (Fr. Cauer). 'Shows a thorough study of the sources and a knowledge of the latest literature.' *Dikaiomata*, II. (F. Zucker).

Dec. 15. E. Belzner, *Homer und das vorhomerische Jahrtausend Griechenlands* (F. Stürmer). 'A valuable contribution.' F. Kutsch, *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen* (W. Nestle). P. Remark, *De amphorarum inscriptionibus latinis quaestiones selectae* (A. Stein). 'Exceptionally good.' H. Bögli, *Beiträge zur Lehre vom ius gentium der Römer* (Grupe).

Dec. 22. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Reden und Vorträge*. 3. Aufl. (Nohl). H. Dachs, *Die λύτις ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου* (F. Stürmer). An exegetic and critical account of Aristarchus' *πρόσωπον τὸ λέγον*. K. Link, *De antiquissimis veterum quae ad Jesum Nazarenum spectant testimonii* (M. Dibelius).

Dec. 29. F. Preisigke, *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten*. I. (P. Viereck). G. Bloch, *La République romaine, les conflits politiques et sociaux* (A. Rosenberg).

1914. Jan. 5. M. H. Ohnefalsch-Richter, *Griechische Sitten und Gebräuche auf Cypern* (W. Dörpfeld). 'Very interesting and learned.' W. v. Bartels, *Die etruskische Bronceleber von Piacenza* (W. Schultz). C. Becher, *De codicibus in Ciceronis oratione Miloniana recte aestimandis* (Nohl).

Jan. 12. E. Nachmanson, *Historische attische Inschriften* (W. Larfeld). E. Biedermann, *Studien zur ägyptischen Verwaltungsgeschichte in ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit* (A. Wiedemann). 'Careful and clear.' E. Kornemann and M. Meyer, *Griechische Papyri*, I. 3, herausg. von E. K. and M. M. (K. Wessely). From the Museum at Giessen.

Jan. 19. A. W. Verrall, *Collected Literary Essays and Collected Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship*, ed. by M. A. Bayfield and J. D. Duff (Fr. Harder). 'The reading of these volumes is always interesting, but for the most part the results appear more than doubtful.' A. Grenier, *Étude sur la formation et l'emploi des composés nominaux dans le latin archaïque* (P. E. Sonnenburet). J. T. Allardice and E. A. Junks, *An Index of the Adverbs of Plautus* (P. E. Sonnenburg).

Jan. 26. J. Dörfler, *Die Kosmogonischen Elemente in der Naturphilosophie des Thales* (Fr. Pfister). F. Boll, *Die Lebensalter* (W. H. Roscher). A contribution to ancient ethnology and the history of numbers. 'An excellent little book.' A. Rosenberg, *Der Staat der alten Italiker* (M. Gelzer).

Feb. 2. G. Leroux, *Vases grecs et italo-grecs du Musée archéologique de Madrid* (H. Lamer). R. Herzog, *Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Literatur in das ionische Alphabet* (J. Sitzler). 'Treated in a detailed and convincing way.' E. M. Walker, *The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, its authorship and authority* (M. Gelzer). 'Deserves a numerous public in Germany also.'

Feb. 9. W. Sternkopf, *Cicero, Ausgewählte Reden*. 9. Bd. Die 7, 8, 9, und 10 *Philippsche Reden*, erkl. von W. S. (A. Kornitzer). J. Tolkiehn, *Dosithei Ars grammatica, rec. J. T. (A. Kraemer)*. R. Foerster, *Libanii opera, rec. R. F. VII* (R. Asmus).

Feb. 16. C. Rothe, *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Illias* (F. Stürmer). 'The leader of the tendency to regard the Homeric poems as a unity.' E. A. Mangelsdorff, *Das lyrische Hochzeitsgedicht bei den Griechen und Römern* (R. Berndt). A. Steier, *Aristoteles und Plinius* (H. Blümner).

Feb. 23. E. Fabricius, *Zur Ariovistschlacht* (R. Oehler). F. Stolle, *Das auf dem sogenannten 'Afterberg' angeblich aufgedeckte Cäsarlager eine 'Dichtung'* (R. Oehler). H. J. Edwards, *T. Livi Ab urbe condita libri. Praefatio. Liber I.* Ed. by H. J. E. (E. Wolff). 'Uneven, but with many excellent points.'

Mar. 2. L. Laurand, *A propos d'Homère. Progrès et recul de la critique* (Fr. Stürmer). 'Has shown the development of criticism from Wolf to the present.' E. Hauler, *Tertentius, Phormio*. 4. Aufl. von E. H. 'An immense advance.' F. W. Shipley, *Preferred and Avoided Combinations of the Enclitic que in Cicero* (J. H. Schmalz). G. Hess, *Sencae ad Lucilium epistulae morales selectae*, erkl. von G. H. 2. Aufl. von R. Mücke (W. Gemoll).

## LANGUAGE.

**Glotta.** V. Band, 3 Heft. 1913.

E. Schwyzer, *Word-studies*; ἔρνος, the *asper* not etymologically justified (cf. ὅρνυμι); κρόμμων; ἀδεια; γεννάν from \*γενεαεν; περσίας; ἐκατόν: ἀλεβηρίς; ὁίξος=ō -F̄i-ξ̄is with the root *sed* in the last syllable. J. H. Schmalz, (i) *Sentence-construction and Negations in Arnobius*, in cases like *vestem illa non norunt, sellas naves atque aratra compingere nec denique superlectilem ceteram* where *nec* is retrospective; (ii) *Mixed Constructions in Latin*, e.g. *me nullam aliam meae Fotidi malle* (*Apul. Met.* 3. 23) a contamination of *malle* and the construction of *praeferre*. Compernass, *Vulgaria, quam citius potest profectus est* (*Mir. Thecl.* 7), *aut non for annon, vel=saltem*, etc. Herbig, *Faliscan datives in -oi, l mouillé in Vulgar Latin*, of which a recent inscription supplies a good instance *piacet* from the year A.D. 101.

**Indogermanische Forschungen.** XXXII. Band, 3, 4, 5 Heft. 1913.

This number contains (pp. 209-318) a very important article on *Qualitative Ablaut* in which Hirt submits to a searching investigation many points left unexplained in his previous researches as published in his work on *Ablaut* (1900), and his *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (2nd ed., 1912): types like \**bhoros* first appeared in the second elements of compounds; the European dialects show a vast extension of the *o* grade, while in Indian the lengthened grade (*Dehnstufe*) gained greatly in extent. Brugmann on *ἄπτω* and its cognates; E. Hermann rejects 'the artificial character' of late Laconian, and emphasizes its natural development. Günther, *Doric Infinitives*; Zimmermann casts doubts on the Etruscan origin of the name *Roma*.

XXXIII. Band, 1, 2 Heft. 1913.

R. Blümel (pp. 1-96) discusses, with numerous parallels from cognate languages, the origin and history of the *Bereichsakkusativ* in Greek. J. Scheftelowitz, *Indogermanic zg. Zg* became *jj* in Old Indian, and not *dg* as generally assumed. In Greek Idg. *z* did not disappear before *γ, β, δ, θ*.

**Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung.** XLV. 4.

W. S[chulze], *An. ganga með veri*: Old Norse parallel to Lat. *ducere*, Skt. *vahati*. Paul Diehls, *Nochmals die spontane Nasalierung*: such nasalisation in Swabian dialect is due to an old *-n-*. W. S., *Kypr. ῥύν <έν-γνα:* Goth. *ala-kjo*. R. Loewe, *Die Haplologie im schwachen Präteritum des Germanischen*: a defence of his theory against Collitz. Althochdeutsch. *w* in *Auslaut*: on the double representation by *o* and *u*. W. S., *Rom. ecco*; occurs first in *Otfried*, 4, 24, 12. H. Jacobsohn: *Got. ögs, lat. vel.* Discussion of question whether the latter is impv. or injunctive. Max. Niedermann, *Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Wortbildung*. *Lupanar <\*lupanal* formed on analogy of *Bacchanal* [*lupānar* : *Bacchānal!*]; *pulicare <puluinus + cervical*. W. S., *Lat. ructus*: associated popularly with *ruptus*. *Dorisches in Thucydides* 5, 77, 79. W. Havers, *Miszellen*. I. *Randbemerkungen zu E. Löfstedt's Philolog. Kommentare zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*: (1) the diminutive, (2) temporal use of *sic, ita*, (3) pleonastic use of *inquit*, (4) *quam* for *quam si*. II. *Mederi* with Dative of the Person = 'jem. heilen.' III. *Ersatzwörter f. Formen des italischen verb. subst.* IV. *mulier quae mulier*. V. *Lat. penes* = 'nach jemandes Ansicht.' W. Schulze, *Zum Gedächtnis Adalbert Kuhns*.

(cf.  
= o  
ion  
tra  
con  
na  
ius  
can  
ood

aut  
in  
uch  
red  
ion  
in  
cial  
er,  
na.

es,  
do-  
In

uti.  
ect  
Die  
nst  
u.  
vel.  
nn,  
of  
us :  
rs,  
tio  
uit,  
tz-  
s =